



CWP-9507-2026

1

2026:PHHC:058835-DB



2026:PHHC:058835-DB

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

115

CWP-9507-2026

DATE OF DECISION: 20.04.2026

SURINDER SINGH

... Petitioner

Versus

UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS

... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA**

Present: Mr. Adish Jain, Advocate for the petitioner.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J. (ORAL)

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that though the petitioner is claiming reinstatement and the same has not been granted by the Central Administrative Tribunal (for short – the ‘Tribunal’) and therefore, the respondents are also liable to be directed to grant the reinstatement from the date when the services of the petitioner were terminated i.e., the year 2011.

2. We have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and have gone through the record with his able assistance.

3. It may be noticed that the petitioner’s services were terminated, which was challenged by filing Original Application (for short - ‘OA’) No.212/PB/2012 which was dismissed by the Tribunal on 07.01.2013. The said dismissal was challenged by the petitioner in CWP-12232-2013, wherein the claim was only restricted to the grant of minimum pay scale. The petitioner further filed OA and the said benefit was also denied by the Tribunal on 02.08.2013. Thereafter, in another writ petition bearing CWP-21803-2013 liberty was given to the petitioner to file a fresh original application claiming the benefit of equal pay for the period the petitioner had worked. The said OA has been allowed by the Tribunal but



aggrieved by the fact that benefit of reinstatement has not been granted, the present petition has been filed.

4. It may be noticed that at no given point of time, in the last 11 years, no benefit with regard to reinstatement though claimed, has been given to the petitioner by this Court, the only liberty by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court given was to seek parity in the pay scale for the post on which the petitioner was working keeping in view the duties already discharged prior to the termination. Once the said liberty was given by the Court under which the benefit of parity in pay has been granted, claiming reinstatement was not even in question either before this Court or the Tribunal, hence no ground is made out for any interference by this Court.

5. The present petition stands dismissed.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

20.04.2026
sapna adhikari

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes
Whether reportable	:	No