

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

1) CWP No.25106 of 2012

Amarjit Singh and others
.....Petitioners
Versus
State of Punjab and others
...Respondents

2) CWP No.25978 of 2012

Baldev Singh and others
.....Petitioners
Versus
State of Punjab and others
...Respondents

3) CWP No.23981 of 2013

Jagjit Singh and others
.....Petitioners
Versus
State of Punjab and others
...Respondents

4) CWP No.26531 of 2013

Gajjan Singh
.....Petitioner
Versus
State of Punjab and others
...Respondents

5) CWP No.22485 of 2013 (O&M)

Surjit Singh
.....Petitioner
Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

6) CWP No.7258 of 2014

Balwinder Singh and others

....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

7) CWP No.10862 of 2014

Sher Singh and others

....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

8) CWP No.19973 of 2014

Joginder Ram and others

....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

Date of Decision : 5.2.2015

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE MAHESH GROVER

....

Present: Mr.Ranjivan Singh, Advocate,
Ms. Monika Jalota, Advocate,
Ms.Gagandeep Kaur, Advocate,
Mr. Neeraj Sharma, Advocate and
Mr. Narinder S.Lucky, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr.Harkesh Manuja, Addl.AG, Punjab.

Mr. Tejinder Joshi, Advocate
for BBMB.

MAHESH GROVER, J.

The aforesaid writ petitions are directed against the policy of the State of Punjab imposing New Contributory Pensionary Scheme made applicable from 1.1.2004 to the service conditions of the petitioners which is impermissible in view of the earlier pronouncement of this Court in **CWP No.2371 of 2010** (*Harbans Lal v. State of Punjab etc.*). They have also prayed that GPF account numbers be allocated to them first to make them eligible for the regular pension and the retiral dues.

It may be mentioned that the judgment of this Court upon which reliance has been placed by the learned counsel for the petitioners was subject matter of SLP which was dismissed on 30.7.2012 (Annexure P-24). This case remained pending on the ground that a review petition has been preferred by the State of Punjab against the aforesaid judgment.

On due consideration of the matter and noticing that the case is squarely covered by the ratio of judgment rendered by this Court in CWP No.2371 of 2010 (Annexure P-23) and upheld by the Hon'ble Supreme Court vide judgment Annexure P-24, I am of the view that no purpose would be served by keeping these petitions alive any further. They are, therefore, disposed of in the same terms as in CWP No.2371 of 2010.

As a consequence, the respondents would be directed

to abide by the directions contained therein and allocate the GPF account numbers so as to make the petitioners admissible to the pensionary benefits subject, however, to the outcome of the review petition.

It has been brought to the notice of this Court that the State itself has been taking a similar view and an order to that effect has been placed on record as **Mark 'X'**.

All the petitions stand disposed of as above.

5.2.2015
dss

(MAHESH GROVER)
JUDGE