



2026:PHHC:076357



2026:PHHC:076357

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

201

CWP-712-2002

Date of decision: 14.05.2026

Narian Dutt Kaushal and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAMIT KUMAR

Present : Mr. Jugam Arora, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Surya Kumar, AAG, Punjab.

NAMIT KUMAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioners under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, seeking a writ of certiorari, for quashing the order dated 23.04.2001 (Annexure P-3), whereby the claim of the petitioners for counting their adhoc service for the purpose of grant of proficiency step up increments, senior/selection grade and seniority, has been rejected and the benefits already granted to them have been withdrawn.

2. Learned State counsel submits that the *ad hoc* service rendered by the petitioners is not countable for the grant of proficiency step up. In support of the said contention, he has produced copy of the judgment dated 17.12.2024, passed in ***CWP No.28652 of 2019 titled as 'R.D. Sharma and others v. State of Haryana and others'***, wherein similar issue has been considered and it has been held as under:-

“xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx

8. *The only issue in the present petition is as to whether the ad hoc service rendered by the petitioners can be counted for grant of ACP benefit.*



xxx

xxx

xxx

xxx

xxx

10. The issue in hand is not *res integra* as it has already been settled by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Haryana Veterinary and A.H.T.S. Association** (*supra*) wherein a Full Bench judgment of this Court in **Rakesh Kumar Singla's** case (majority view) has been overruled by holding that only the regular service can be counted for the purpose of grant of selection grade. The said judgment has been followed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Jaggiwan Ram's** case (*supra*), wherein after considering various judgments, it has been held as under: -

“10. The ratio of the above mentioned judgments is that work charged employees constitute a distinct class and they cannot be equated with any other category or class of employees much less regular employees and further that the work charged employees are not entitled to the service benefits which are admissible to regular employees under the relevant rules or policy framed by the employer.

11. What to say of work charged employees even those appointed on *ad hoc* basis cannot claim parity with regular employees in the matter of pay fixation, grant of higher scales of pay, promotion etc. In **State of Haryana v. Haryana Veterinary & AHTS Association and another** (*supra*), a three-Judge Bench considered the question whether service of an employee appointed on *ad hoc* basis can be equated with that of regular employee for the purpose of grant of selection grade in terms of the policy contained in circulars dated 2nd June, 1989 and 16th May, 1990 issued by the Government of Haryana and answered the same in negative. The facts of that case were that one Rakesh Kumar Singla who joined service as Assistant Engineer on *ad hoc* basis on 4.1.1980 was appointed on regular basis with effect from 29.8.1982 after selection by the Public Service Commission. He represented to the Government for grant of selection grade on completion of 12 years service commencing from 4.1.1980. As the Government did not accede to his request, Rakesh Kumar Singla filed writ petition in the High Court. On a reference made by the Division Bench, the matter was placed before a bench of three-Judges. By majority judgment, the larger bench held that the service rendered by an employee on the basis of *ad hoc* appointment must be clubbed with his regular service for the purpose of grant of selection grade in terms of the policy framed by the State Government. This Court reversed the judgment of the High Court and held :



"Coming to the circular dated 2-6-1989, issued by the Financial Commissioner and Secretary to the Government of Haryana, Finance Department, it appears that the aforesaid circular had been issued for removal of anomalies in the pay scale of Doctors, Deputy Superintendents and Engineers, and so far as Engineers are concerned, which are in Class I and Class II, it was unequivocally indicated that the revised pay scale of Rs. 3000 to Rs. 4500 can be given after completion of 5 years of regular service and Rs. 4100 to Rs. 5300 after completion of 12 years of regular service. The said Financial Commissioner had issued yet another circular dated 16-5-1990, in view of certain demands made by officers of different departments. The aforesaid circular was issued after reconsideration by the Government modifying to some extent the earlier circular of 2-6-1989, and even in this circular it was categorically indicated that so far as Engineers are concerned, they would get Rs.3000 to 4500 after 5 years of regular and satisfactory service and selection grade in the scale of pay of Rs. 4100 to Rs.5300, which is limited to the extent of 20% of the cadre post should be given after 12 years of regular and satisfactory service.

The aforesaid two circulars are unambiguous and unequivocally indicate that a Government servant would be entitled to the higher scale indicated therein only on completion of 5 years or 12 years of regular service and further the number of persons to be entitled to get the selection grade is limited to 20% of the cadre post. This being the position, we fail to understand how services rendered by Rakesh Kumar from 1980 to 1982, which was purely on ad hoc basis, and was not in accordance with the statutory rules can be taken into account for computation of the period of 12 years indicated in the circular. The majority judgment of the High Court committed serious error by equating expression "regular service" with "continuous service". In our considered opinion under the terms and conditions of the circulars dated 2-6-1989 and 16-5-1990, the respondent Rakesh Kumar would be entitled for being considered to have the selection grade on completion of 12 years from 29-1-1982 on which date he was duly appointed against a temporary post of Assistant Engineer on being



selected by the Public Service Commission and not from any earlier point of time. The conclusion of the majority judgment in favour of Rakesh Kumar, therefore, cannot be sustained."

The Court then referred to the provisions contained in the Haryana Service of Engineers, Class-II, Public Works Department (Irrigation Branch) Rules, 1970 and held :-

"A combined reading of the aforesaid provisions of the Recruitment Rules puts the controversy beyond any doubt and the only conclusion which could be drawn from the aforesaid Rules is that the services rendered either on an ad hoc basis or as a stopgap arrangement, as in the case in hand from 1980 to 1982 cannot be held to be regular service for getting the benefits of the revised scale of pay or of the selection grade under the Government memorandum dated 2- 6-1989 and 16-5-1990, and therefore, the majority judgment of the High Court must be held to be contrary to the aforesaid provisions of the Recruitment Rules, consequently cannot be sustained. The initial letter of appointment dated 6-12-1979 pursuant to which respondent Rakesh Kumar joined as an Assistant Engineer on an ad hoc basis in 1980 was also placed before us. The said appointment letter unequivocally indicates that the offer of appointment as Assistant Engineer was on ad hoc basis and clauses 1 to 4 of the said letter further provides that the appointment will be on an ad hoc basis for a period of 6 months from the date of joining and the salary was a fixed salary of Rs. 400 p.m. in the scale of Rs. 400 to Rs. 1100 and the services were liable to be terminated without any notice and at any time without assigning any reason and that the appointment will not enable the appointee any seniority or any other benefit under the Service Rules for the time being in force and will not count towards increment in the time scale. In view of the aforesaid stipulations in the offer of appointment itself we really fail to understand as to how the aforesaid period of service rendered on ad hoc basis can be held to be service on regular basis. The conclusion of the High Court is contrary to the very terms and conditions stipulated in the offer of



appointment and, therefore, the same cannot be sustained. The regular letter of appointment dated 29-1-1982 in favour of Rakesh Kumar was also produced before us and that letter indicates that the respondent Rakesh Kumar along with others had applied to the Secretary, Haryana Public Service Commission for being appointed as an Assistant Engineer and the Service Commission after selecting the number of persons prepared a list and appointment letters were issued by the Government from the said list on the basis of the merit position of different candidates. Thus the appointment of respondent Rakesh Kumar was a fresh appointment in accordance with the statutory rules after the Public Service Commission adjudged their suitability and the regular service of the respondent Rakesh Kumar must be counted from the date he joined the post pursuant to the offer of appointment dated 29-1-1982 and the prior service rendered by him on ad hoc basis cannot be held to be regular service nor can it be tagged on to the later service for earning the benefit under the Government circular dated 2-6-1989 as well as the clarificatory circular dated 16-5-1990. The conclusion of the majority judgment of the High Court, therefore, is wholly erroneous and cannot be sustained."

12. In *State of Punjab and others v. Ishar Singh and others*, 2002(1) SCT 72 : [(2002)10 SCC 674] and *State of Punjab and others v. Gurdeep Kumar Uppal and others* [(2003)11 SCC 732], the two-Judge Benches referred to the judgment in ***State of Haryana v. Haryana Veterinary & AHTS Association*** (supra) and held that adhoc service rendered by the respondents cannot be clubbed with their regular service for the purpose of grant of revised pay scales, senior/selection grade, proficiency step-up and for fixation of seniority.

13. A reading of the scheme framed by the Board makes it clear that the benefit of time bound promotional scales was to be given to the employees only on their completing 9/16 years regular service. Likewise, the benefit of promotional increments could be given only on completion of 23 years regular service. The use of the term 'regular service' in various paragraphs of the scheme shows that service rendered by an employee after regular



appointment could only be counted for computation of 9/16/23 years service and the service of a temporary, adhoc or work charged employee cannot be counted for extending the benefit of time bound promotional scales or promotional increments. If the Board intended that total service rendered by the employees irrespective of their mode of recruitment and status should be counted for the purpose of grant of time bound promotional scales or promotional increments, then instead of using the expression '9/16 years regular service' or '23 years regular service', the concerned authority would have used the expression '9/16 years service' or '23 years service'. However, the fact of the matter is that the scheme in its plainest term embodies the requirement of 9/16 years regular service or 23 years regular service as a condition for grant of time bound promotional scales or promotional increments as the case may be. For the reasons mentioned above, we hold that the respondents were not entitled to the benefit of time bound promotional scales/promotional increments on a date prior to completion of 9/16/23 years error by directing the appellants to give them benefit of the scheme by counting their work charged service.”

11. *To the same effect are the Division Bench judgments of this Court in the cases of **Amarjit Singh** and **Gurcharan Singh** (supra).*

12. *Learned Single Judge of this Court in **Parmod Kumar's** case (supra), after considering the upto date law on the subject, has held as under: -*

“43. For what has been discussed above, it is held that:-

(i) The petitioners are not entitled to count their period of ad hoc/work-charged/temporary service towards seniority in the cadre before the date they were regularized and became members of service for the first time in terms of the relevant policies of State Government.

(ii) The petitioners are not entitled to benefit of Additional Increments for the period of their ad hoc/work-charged service on completion of 8/18 years of service as well as 10/20 years, since such period does not qualify as regular satisfactory service as per modified scheme dated August 7, 1992.

(iii) Similarly, the petitioners are not entitled



to the benefit of financial upgradations of Higher Standard Scale or to the Assured Career Progression Scales for the period of their ad hoc/work charge/temporary service etc. Only regular service rendered satisfactorily counts for claiming rights to these monetary benefits strictly as per the provisions of these schemes.

xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners could not dispute the assertion of the learned State counsel.

4. Keeping in view the above, finding no merit in the present petition, the same is hereby dismissed.

14.05.2026

Vinay

**(NAMIT KUMAR)
JUDGE**

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