

2025:PHHC:089939



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

114

**CWP-13966-2025 (O&M)  
Date of Decision: 21.07.2025.**

TEK RAM CHAUHAN AND ANOTHER

...PETITIONERS

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

...RESPONDENTS

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ**

Present Mr. Arun Kumar Goyat, Advocate,  
for the petitioners.

Mr. Vivek Chauhan, Addl. A.G. Haryana.

**VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)**

**CM-10020-CWP-2025**

In view of the averments in the application, the same is allowed as prayed for subject to all just exceptions.

The main writ petition which was adjourned sine die vide order dated 15.05.2025, is taken up on board for hearing today itself.

**Main case**

The petitioners have approached this Court for seeking issuance of directions to the respondents for granting benefit of one increment and all other consequential benefits with arrears on completion of more than 6 months of service as the petitioners retired from January to June in a calendar year.

2025:PHHC:089939



2 Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners contends that the issue has already been decided by a Division Bench of this Court in a batch of writ petitions including **CWP-14627-2024 titled “Mahabir Singh Tanwar versus State of Haryana and others” decided on 24.04.2025.** He further submits that the Division Bench has placed reliance on the judgment of the Hon’ble Supreme Court passed in **Civil Appeal No.3933 of 2023 decided on 19.05.2023 titled as Union of India and Another Versus Siddaraj** along with connected misc. applications. It was specifically noticed by the Division Bench that a detailed order was passed in the subsequent intervening applications on 20.02.2025 and that in view of the said authoritative pronouncements, it would be inconsequential to await for the final adjudication of the other SLPs involving similar issue(s).

3 Learned State Counsel is not in a position to controvert the adjudication by a Division Bench but he submits that some SLPs are still pending before the Hon’ble Supreme Court in respect to the same issue.

4 Be that as it may, since the judgment has now been passed by a Division Bench of this Court specifically after noticing the pending SLPs before the Hon’ble Supreme Court, vide its **judgment dated 24.04.2025 (supra)** and holding that their pendency would have no bearing, the present writ petition is **disposed of** in light of the said judgment **dated 24.04.2025 titled as Mahabir Singh Tanwar (supra)** with a direction to the respondents to consider the claim of the petitioners for grant of increment and to pass a reasoned and speaking order within a period of three months of the receipt of certified copy of this order, after taking into consideration the order/judgment of the Hon’ble Supreme Court in **Civil Appeal No.3933 of 2023** decided on

2025:PHHC:089939



**19.05.2023** titled as ***Union of India and Another Versus Siddaraj*** as well as the order/judgment of the Division Bench of this Court dated **24.04.2025** titled as ***Mahabir Singh Tanwar (supra)***.

5           Needless to say that in the event the petitioners are found entitled to the claimed benefit, the same be also released in their favour within a further period of two months, along with arrears if any.

**July 21, 2025.**  
**raj arora**

**(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)**  
**JUDGE**

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