



224

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-1604-2025
DECIDED ON: 15.05.2026

KANTA KUMARI AND OTHERS

.....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

.....RESPONDENT(S)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Tejpal Singh Dhull, Advocate
for the petitioner(s)

Mr. Rahul Dev Singh, Addl. AG Haryana

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

1. The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India with a prayer that this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to issue an appropriate writ, order or direction quashing order/letter dated 27.06.2024 (P-11) issued by respondent no. 2 whereby in a completely illegal, arbitrary manner and without their being any basis for the said impugned action and further without any authority or jurisdiction, the respondent no. 2 has issued directions to freeze the benefits as admissible to petitioners under the State Health Mission Service Bye-laws 2018, as issued and notified by respondent Health Mission under which the petitioners have been held entitled to the benefit of pay fixation and further directions has been issued to withdraw benefits granted after dates 27.06.2024 thus, reducing/re-fixing the monthly salaries of all petitioners, without any opportunity of hearing and without any show cause notice.



2. Learned counsel for the petitionerS submits that the issue involved in the present writ petition is no longer *res integra* and already stands adjudicated by this Court vide order dated 17.11.2025 passed in **CWP-3472-2025 titled as “Dr. Neha Bansal vs. State of Haryana and Others”**. While claiming parity with the same, it is contended that the facts and legal issues involved in the present case are identical to those considered and decided in the aforesaid judgment and, therefore, the petitioners are entitled to the same relief.

3. In compliance to the last order dated 30.04.2026, learned State counsel informs the Court that the case of the petitioner is squarely covered by the aforesaid judgment and further states that he has no objection to the adjudication of the matter in terms of the judgment rendered by this Court in **Dr. Neha Bansal’s case (supra)**.

4. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and upon perusal of the record, this Court is of the considered view that the controversy raised in the present petition is squarely covered by the judgment dated 17.11.2025 passed in **Dr. Neha Bansal’s case (supra)**.

5. Consequently, the present writ petition is disposed of in terms of the order rendered in **Dr. Neha Bansal’s case (supra)**. The respondents are directed to extend the same benefits to the petitionerS, as admissible under law, within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

6. Ordered accordingly.

7. Pending application(s), if any shall stand disposed off.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

15.05.2026

Meenu

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No