

2025:PHHC:129922



RSA-3651-2000

1

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

RSA-3651-2000

Date of decision : 19.09.2025

State of Haryana and others

... Appellants

Versus

Braham Parkash

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Raj Partap Singh Brar, AAG, Haryana
for the appellants.

Mr.R.K. Malik, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Ankur Sheoran, Advocate
for the respondents.

VIKAS BAHL, J.(ORAL)

1. The respondent-plaintiff had filed a suit in the year 1997 for regularization of the services of the plaintiff as he had completed three years on 31.12.1995. Further challenge was made to the order dated 31.01.1997 vide which the services of the plaintiff were terminated / retrenched with immediate effect. The suit filed by the plaintiff was decreed by the trial Court and the order dated 31.01.1997 was set aside and it was further directed that the case of the plaintiff for regularization of the services on completion of necessary condition according to the instructions issued on the subject be decided by the competent authority within a period of one



month from the date of decision. The appeal filed by the State of Haryana was dismissed by the Ist Appellate Court.

2. A perusal of the paper book would show that at the time of admission of matter, it was specifically stated that there would be no stay. On 11.02.2013, when the matter was listed before the Pre-Lok Adalat, the following order was passed:-

“Present:- Mr.J.S. Pannu, AAG, Haryana.

*Mr. R.K.Malik, Advocate
for the respondent.*

Not present.

Learned State counsel, after going through the judgments of the two Courts below, states that no substantial question of law arises in this appeal for the consideration of this court especially when the appellant is continuing in service for the last more than twenty years.

Returned to the High Court.

Keeping in view the above situation, this appeal may be listed before an Hon’ble Single Judge for final disposal after seeking orders from Hon’ble the Chief Justice.

11.02.2013.”

3. Learned senior counsel for the respondents has submitted that in pursuance of the impugned judgment, the respondent-plaintiff has been regularized in service w.e.f. 01.02.1996 and has also been promoted as a Clerk w.e.f. January, 2008 and has submitted that thus, nothing survives in the present appeal.

4. Learned counsel for the appellants has submitted that in view of the subsequent facts and circumstances, the present appeal be disposed of

2025:PHHC:129922



RSA-3651-2000

3

but liberty be granted to the appellants to revive the same, in case, any cause survives.

5. In view of the above, the present appeal is disposed of with the aforesaid liberty.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

September 19, 2025.

Davinder Kumar

Whether speaking / reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No

Yes/No