



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH**

**LPA No. 940 of 2025(O&M)  
Date of Decision: 27.03.2025.**

**Punjab and Haryana High Court and another**

**.....Appellants**

Versus

**Om Parkash and another**

**..... Respondents**

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS.JUSTICE LISA GILL  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK JAIN**

Present: Mr. Rajeev Anand, Advocate  
for appellants.

\*\*\*\*\*

**LISA GILL, J.**

**CM-2343-LPA of 2025.**

Heard.

For the reasons mentioned in the application as well as arguments addressed, delay of 31 days in filing the present appeal is condoned subject to just exceptions.

Application is accordingly disposed of.

**LPA No. 940 of 2025.**

1. Prayer in this appeal is for setting aside order dated 15.01.2025 passed by learned Single Bench, whereby writ petition filed by respondents has been allowed in terms of decision dated 24.05.2016 passed in **CWP No 2261 of 2011, titled as Gobind Rai and others Vs. Punjab and Haryana High Court and another.**

2. CWP No. 22920 of 2022 was filed by the respondent being aggrieved of rejection of his request for grant of ACP w.e.f., 01.01.2008 on the ground that there was a pay revision which was given effect to in the year 2003 and thereafter, period of 10 years which is required for the grant of ACP is to be taken from said revision of pay scale and not from the date of continuous appointment in the cadre, in which benefit of ACP Scheme is being claimed. Learned Single Bench concluded that the matter is squarely covered in favour of writ-petitioner in view of **decision dated 24.05.2016 passed in CWP No. 2261 of 2011, titled as Gobind Rai and others Vs. Punjab and Haryana High Court Chandigarh and another** as well as **decision dated 21.12.2017 in CWP No. 6569 of 2009, titled as Rajesh Kumar Saini and others Vs. State of Haryana and others.**

3. Learned counsel for the appellants is unable to deny that decision dated 24.05.2016 in CWP No. 2261 of 2011, has attained finality, with LPA No. 1324 of 2017 filed by present appellants challenging decision dated 24.05.2016 being dismissed on 26.02.2018. He is unable to point out any distinction in the case of present respondent/writ-petitioners which calls for a separate dispensation.

4. Accordingly, the present appeal is also dismissed with no order as to costs. Pending application(s), if any, stand(s) disposed of accordingly.

(LISA GILL )  
JUDGE

(ALOK JAIN)  
JUDGE

March 27, 2025.

s.khan

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No.  
Whether reportable : Yes/No