



CWP- 9407-2025

-1-

116

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

CWP- 9407-2025

Date of Decision: 24.04.2025

AJAB SINGH AND OTHERS

..... PETITIONERS

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

... RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present: Mr. Raywant Kaushish, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Ms. Tanushree Gupta, DAG, Haryana.

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J. (ORAL)

The petition has been filed seeking a writ of *mandamus* directing the respondents to release arrear of pay and other benefits in terms of order passed by the Director, Secondary Education vide memo dated 28.05.2019, along with interest at the rate of twelve per cent per annum.

2. Learned State counsel has received instructions vide memo, dated 23.04.2025, which is retained on the case file as 'Annexure A'; it is to the following effect:

In this context, it is submitted that the petitioners had previously filed CWP No. 35348 of 2019 titled as Ajab Singh & Others vs. State of Haryana & Others which was disposed of on 05.12.2019 with the direction to decide the legal notice dated 14.08.2019 of the petitioners. Accordingly on examination, the petitioners No.1, 3 and 4 were found entitled for regularisation w.e.f 01.05.2017 and petitioner No.2 was found entitled for



CWP- 9407-2025

-2-

regularisation w.e.f. 24.10.2017 and arrears of salary amounting to Rs. 1,17,366/-, 1,38,363/- and, 142212/- had already been released to petitioner Nos. 1,3 and 4. The petitioner No.2 has already been getting salary as a regular employee from the date of her regularisation i.e. from 24.10.2017 and hence, the question of arrears in case of petitioner No.2 does not arise at all.

As far as letter dated 28.05.2019 of the Directorate is concerned, in that letter, the direction was given to release the arrears of those eligible employees who were entitled for regularisation from the year 2011 but could not be regularised at that time. But in the case of the petitioners, the situation is different.

Since the petitioners are found entitled in the year 2017 and they had been granted the arrears from the respective dates of their regularisation, so, the present petition of the petitioners is liable to be dismissed.

On that basis, she contends that the petitioners have already been released due benefits based upon their respective dates of regularisation, and nothing is outstanding.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners is not in a position to dispute the facts aforementioned.

4. In view thereof, nothing survives for adjudication and the petition stands dismissed.

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE

24.04.2025

Sima

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No

Whether reportable Yes/No