



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

119

CWP-13290-2026

Date of Decision: 14.05.2026

VIKRAM

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

DEENABANDU CHHOTU RAM UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND
TECHNOLOGY, MURTHAL AND ANOTHER

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present:- Mr. Bhupinder Malik, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Anuj Dewan, Advocate
for the respondents.

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J. (Oral)

The petition has been filed, *inter alia*, seeking a writ of *mandamus* directing the respondents to extend the benefit of increment to the petitioner from July, 2021, as also Assured Career Progression (ACP) scale in the light of the judgment dated 29.07.2025, rendered in CWP-17851-2021 titled *Parveen Kumar and another v. Deenbandu Chhotu Ram University of Science and Technology, Murthal and others*, since the petitioner is identically placed.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in terms of the aforementioned judgment the University has already granted the benefits to another similarly placed employee, who approached this Court by filing CWP-27358-2025 titled *Suresh Kumar v. Deenbandu Chhotu Ram University of Science and Technology, Murthal and another*. He further submits that only those employees who are approaching this Court, are being given the benefit



in terms of the law laid down. The University is bound to extend the benefit to all similarly placed employees without forcing them to approach this Court. It amounts to unnecessary harassment and is also in violation of the settled position in law that the benefits admissible to employees on the basis of a judgment that has attained finality, must be extended as per their entitlement. However, at this stage, the petitioner will be satisfied in case respondent no.1 is directed to decide the pending representation, dated 24.03.2026, Annexure P-18, in a specified period.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Learned counsel for the respondents accepts notice and submits that the pending representation, dated 24.03.2026, will be decided by respondent no.1/Registrar of the University, by passing a speaking/reasoned order within a period of three months, keeping in view the law laid down in *Parveen Kumar* case (*supra*).

5. In view of the statement made, learned counsel for the petitioner has no objection to the petition being disposed of in terms thereof.

6. Ordered accordingly.

7. In case the order is not passed within the stipulated period, the officer concerned shall pay costs of ₹50,000 to the petitioner.

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE

14.05.2026

Ad

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No