

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH.

Sr. No. 216

Case No. : C. W. P.No. 20461 of 2013

Date of Decision : May 18, 2015

Ajit Singh

.... Petitioner

Vs.

Dr. B. R. Ambedkar National Institute  
of Technology, Jalandhar and others

.... Respondents

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL.**

\* \* \*

*To be referred to Reporters or not ?*

*Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ?*

\* \* \*

Present : Mr. Amarjit Singh Virk, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Dr. Anmol Rattan Sidhu, Senior Advocate  
with Mr. Suvir Sidhu, Advocate  
for respondents no. 1, 2 and 4.

\* \* \*

**DEEPAK SIBAL, J. :**

Through the present petition, the petitioner has approached this Court impugning his suspension, seeking a direction to respondents no. 1 and 2 to accept his resignation and has further challenged the action of the respondents seeking recovery from him on the ground that the petitioner has

been placed in a higher pay scale than the one he was entitled to.

During the pendency of the writ petition, on 01.02.2015, the respondents have permitted the petitioner to be reinstated in service and accepting such order, the petitioner has joined his service.

In view of the above, learned counsel for the petitioner states that the petitioner does not press the prayer with regard to issuance of direction to the respondents to accept the resignation of the petitioner. He further does not press the challenge to the order of suspension of the petitioner. However, a prayer made for the issuance of a direction to the respondents to consider and decide so as to how the period of suspension of the petitioner is to be treated, as also to decide the grievance of the petitioner regarding fixation of the pay scales applicable to the petitioner, from the date of his appointment.

I find the prayer made by the learned counsel for the petitioner to be reasonable.

Accordingly, at this stage, without commenting on the merits of the case, respondents no. 1 and 2 are directed to consider and take a final decision on the representation, to be submitted by the petitioner, by passing a speaking order, so as to how the period of suspension of the petitioner is to be treated, as also to fix the applicable pay scales in the case of the petitioner, from the date of his appointment, preferably within six months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

Needless to add that the decision so taken be communicated to the petitioner and if the decision is not to the satisfaction of the petitioner, he would be at liberty to challenge the same, in accordance with law.

**( DEEPAK SIBAL )  
JUDGE**

**May 18, 2015**  
*monika*