

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

**CWP No.958 of 2012**

**Date of Decision:16/07/2015**

Kashmiri Lal

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Peeush Gagneja, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Ms. Minakshi Goel, A.A.G. Punjab.

Mr. Amit Aggarwal, Advocate  
for respondent No.2.

1. To be referred to the reporters or not?
2. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest?

**DEEPAK SIBAL, J. ( Oral )**

Learned counsel for the petitioner has placed on record order dated 13.08.2014 passed by the Secretary, Punjab Government, Local Government Department. The same reads as under:

“  
*PUNJAB GOVERNMENT*  
*LOCAL GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENT*  
*(Municipal Service Cell)*

*No.S-1-DLG-MS-2014/393 DATED CHANDIGARH 29.8.2014*

*Bill Distributors/Bill Messangers and Meter Readers working in the Urban Local Bodies, under the Punjab Government had been approved to be granted, equal pay scale to the Clerks working in the State, (10300-34800-3200) Grade Pay, vide Finance Department Circular letter No.5/10/09-5 FP-1/983 dated 15.12.2011. Vide order No.S-1-DLG-MS-12/159 Dated 24.01.2012, employees of these categories were granted aforesaid Pay Scale equal to that of Clerks, on the condition, that their cadre will be separate from the cadre of clerks, and their qualification will be that of clerks.*

*2. After consideration on the part of the Government, the decision has been taken, that Bill Distributors/Bill Messangers and Meter Readers working in the Municipal Corporations-Municipal Councils, Municipal Panchayats, are considered to be clerks, and*

*they are merged into the cadre of Clerks, and they will be granted benefit of seniority, in the cadre of clerks, from the date of being clerks.*

*These orders will be implemented from the date of issuance of letter.*

*Dated: Chandigarh*

*Ashok Kumar Gupta IAS*

*13.08.2014*

*Secretary, Punjab Government*

*Local Government Department.”*

In view of the above quoted order, learned counsel for the petitioner seeks withdrawal of the present writ petition to make a comprehensive representation to respondent No.3 with regard to the grievances made by him in the present writ petition.

Dismissed as withdrawn with the above liberty.

In case any such representation is made to respondent No.3, it is directed that the same shall be considered and decided by passing a well reasoned and speaking order thereupon and after granting hearing to the petitioner within four months from the date of receipt of such representation.

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**

16.07.2015  
rajeev