



2025:UHC:11396

SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			<u>WPSS/ 2183/ 2025</u> <u>Hon'ble Manoj Kumar Tiwari, J</u> 1. Mr. Vinay Kumar, learned counsel for the petitioners. 2. Mr. Manoj Kumar, learned Central Government Standing Counsel for the Union of India. 3. Mr. Vikas Pande, learned counsel for respondent no. 3. 4. Petitioners are serving as Assistant Grade-II (LDC) in Wild Life Institute of India, Dehradun. According to them, they are entitled to pay scale in Pay Matrix Level-II, it is being paid to respondent no. 4, yet their pay has been fixed at a lower level. 5. It is contended that petitioners and respondent no. 4 were regularised together on the post of Assistant Grade-III, therefore, there cannot be any disparity in their pay scale. 6. Mr. Vikas Pande, learned counsel appearing for Wild Life Institute of India, however, submits that respondent no. 4 was appointed on contract as Computer Assistant before his regularisation, while petitioners served as Lower Division Clerk before their regularisation; as Computer Assistant, respondent no. 4 was getting more amount as salary, which is the reason his pay was fixed at a higher level. 7. In reply, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that even though petitioners have been promoted to the



		next higher post of Assistant Grade-II yet they are getting lesser amount as salary compared to respondent no. 4, even though respondent no. 4 has not been promoted and he is still serving as LDC. 8. Perusal of record reveals that petitioners had made representation, highlighting their grievances before the Registrar, Wild Life Institute of India and Registrar has rejected their claim, vide order dated 28.04.2025, however, the rejection order passed by Registrar is non-speaking and does not disclose any reason, why claim of petitioners was not entertained. It merely refers to a judgment rendered in SPA No. 455 of 2018. 9. Perusal of said judgment, however, indicates that there is no observation made in the judgment, which may be relied upon by Registrar for denying benefit of pay parity. 10. Since the impugned order is bereft of reason and for exercising power of judicial review there has to be some concrete reason in the impugned order, therefore, on this sole ground alone, the writ petition is allowed. The rejection order dated 28.04.2025 is set aside. The Registrar is directed to pass a reasoned and speaking order dealing with the all the issues raised by petitioners in their representation. Such decision shall be taken within three months from the date of presentation of certified copy of this order. (Manoj Kumar Tiwari, J) 19.12.2025
--	--	--



2025:UHC:11396