



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

113

CWP-31068-2026
Date of decision: 22.09.2026

Suraj Bhan and others

....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Dinesh Kumar, Mr.Arvind Galav and Mr. Dharamjit,
Advocates for the petitioner.

Mr. Rahul Dev Singh, Addl. AG Haryana.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR J. (Oral)

1. The present writ petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking issuance of a writ, order or direction, especially a writ in the nature of *mandamus* directing the respondents to extend the benefit of judgment dated 15.07.2019 (Annexure P-7) passed in *CWP-4293-2015, Devender Sachdeva and others Versus State of Haryana and others and 09 other connected writ petitions* (Main Case *CWP-19988-2011, Ram Rattan and others Versus State of Haryana and others*) against which LPAs filed by the State of Haryana have been dismissed vide order dated 13.03.2023 (Annexure P-8) and further *Special Leave to Appeal (Civil) Nos.8266-8284-2023* have been dismissed vide



order dated 15.12.2025 (Annexure P-9) to the petitioners and refix their pay by granting the Grade Pay of Rs.3600/- instead of Rs.3200/- w.e.f. 01.01.2006 with further revision/modification of the pay scales granted from time to time with all other consequential benefits. Further praying for quashing the order dated 16.02.2026 (Annexure P-11) confining the implementation of the judgment dated 15.07.2019 (Annexure P-7) qua petitioners only being in violation of well settled principle that the judgment in rem is to be applied to all similarly situated employees and further in violation of the Haryana Litigation Policy, 2025 and Division Bench judgment of this Court in case of ***Satbir Singh Versus State of Haryana reported in 2002(2) SCT 354*** followed by government instructions dated 02.05.2002 (Annexure P-15). Further directing respondents to treat the legal notice dated 20.04.2026 on behalf of all writ petitioners and decide the claim made out in the said legal notice dated 20.04.2026 (Annexure P-13)/treat this petition as representation.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners, at the very outset, submits, he would be satisfied in case the present writ petition is treated as a comprehensive representation and considered and decided in a time-bound manner by passing a speaking order.

3. On advance notice, learned State counsel accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and submits that he has no objection in case a direction is issued to respondent No.1 to treat the present writ petition as a comprehensive representation and consider and decide the same within a time-bound period by passing a speaking order.



4. In view of the limited prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioners, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.1/competent authority to treat the present writ petition as a comprehensive representation and consider and decide the same by passing a speaking order, in the light of the judgments rendered in **CWP-19988-2011** (Annexure P-7), **LPA-301-2020** (Annexure P-8) and **Special Leave to Appeal (Civil) No(s).8266-8284-2023** (Annexure P-9), after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioners, within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order. The decision so taken shall be conveyed to the petitioners.

5. Needless to observe that in case the petitioners are found entitled to any relief, the same shall be extended to them in accordance with law.

6. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

22.09.2026

P.C

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes/No

Whether reportable:

Yes/No