



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

202

CWP-10428-2021

Date of decision : 21.08.2026

Rinku Singh and others

....Petitioners

V/S

State of Punjab and others

....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAMIT KUMAR

Present: Mr. C.S. Bakshi, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Vikas Sonak, A.A.G., Punjab.

NAMIT KUMAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioners have filed the instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, seeking issuance of a writ of certiorari for quashing of Clause 1 in the appointment letter dated 11.11.2017 (Annexure P-2), issued to the petitioners, whereby the petitioners were entitled for 03 years of probation period pursuant to their appointments, fixed emoluments in the pay scale of Rs.10300-34800 + Grade Pay of Rs.3200/-, which is contrary to the pay scale and pay band provided in the advertisement (Annexure P-1) and for quashing the order dated 14.05.2020 (Annexure P-6), passed by the respondents, whereby the legal notice served by the petitioners has been rejected. Further, seeking issuance of a writ of mandamus directing the respondents to pay the petitioners the arrears of total appropriate salary for the probation period of 03 years of their service in the regular pay scale i.e. Rs.10300-34800 + Grade Pay of Rs.3200/- and other



CWP-10428-2021

-2-

allowances as admissible as were paid in the case of regular Constables from the date of their joining with interest @ 12% per annum.

2. Learned counsel for the parties are ad idem that the present case is squarely covered by the judgment passed by a Division Bench of this Court in ***CWP No.6391 of 2016 titled as ‘Dr. Vishavdeep Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and others’*** and other connected case decided on 26.10.2018 (Annexure P-10), wherein similar claim raised by the similarly situated employees has been accepted, which is under challenged before the Hon’ble Supreme Court in ***SLP (Civil) Diary No(s).11476 of 2020 titled as ‘The State of Punjab and others Vs. Dr. Vishavdeep Singh and others’***, wherein, while issuing notice in the special leave petitions as well as on the applications for condonation of delay, it has further been ordered that contempt petitions, if any, shall not be proceeded with.

3. Since the matter is covered by the abovesaid judgment passed by the Division Bench of this Court and the same is sub-judice before the Hon’ble Supreme Court, the present petition is disposed of in the same terms. However, the same shall be implemented after and subject to the decision of the Hon’ble Supreme Court in the abovesaid SLP.

21.08.2026

kothiyal

(NAMIT KUMAR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable:	Yes/No