



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

201

CWP-16570-2023 (O&M)

Date of decision: 02.08.2025

Shanker Lal

..Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present: Mr. Geeteshwar Saini, Advocate for
Mr. RK Arya, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Charanpreet Singh, AAG, Punjab.

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer made in the present petition for quashing of order dated 16.05.2023 (Annexure P4) rejecting the claim of the petitioner.
2. Learned counsel submits that the petitioner was initially appointed as Class-IV employee on 89 days basis, whereafter his services came to be regularized on 23.10.2003 and retired on attaining the age of superannuation on 31.03.2019. The period rendered prior to regularisation has not been taken into account for purpose of pay fixation, proficiency step up, pensionary and retiral benefits, despite it being squarely covered by the judgment in **Sanjeev Kumar and other vs. State of Punjab and others**, CWP-17906-2022 and connected case, decided on 16.05.2024 by relying on **Harbans Lal vs. State of Punjab and others**, CWP-2371-2010, decided on 31.08.2010, **Jeewan Lata vs. State of Punjab and others**, CWP-10238-2017, decided on 10.05.2019 and **Babunji Bhagat vs. State of Punjab and others**, CWP-14728-2018, decided on 01.02.2023, which stands implemented on filing of COCP-4127-2024.
3. Learned State counsel, despite best efforts, has not been able to controvert as regards the factual position and draw out any distinctive aspects in the aforementioned decision or cite any contrary law.
4. The present petition is disposed of in terms of **Sanjeev Kumar** (supra).

02.08.2025

ashok

**(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No