

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

CWP No.8454 of 2015
Date of decision: 01.05.2015

Sudesh Kumari

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI

Present: Mr. Arun Takhi, Advocate, for the petitioner.

1. Whether reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest?

ARUN PALLI J. (Oral)

Writ in the nature of mandamus is prayed for, so as to direct the respondents to release the arrears of pay admissible to the petitioner on account of revision of pay scales w.e.f. 01.01.2006 along with interest till its realization. It is averred that the petitioner was appointed as ETT teacher vide appointment letter dated 18.09.2006, and was placed in the pay scale of ₹ 4550-150-5000-160-5800-200-7000-220-7220 plus allowances etc. (Annexure P1). She joined the duty on 19.09.2006, at Government Elementary School, Sanchak, District Hoshiarpur. And later, she was selected and appointed as Teacher in the Secondary Education Department. As a result, she submitted her resignation that was duly accepted by respondent No.3, vide order dated 19.09.2008.

Government of Punjab revised the pay scales of teachers on

12.02.2014 and the requisite arrears were accordingly released. Inasmuch as, the arrears were also released to those ETT teachers, who as the petitioner had also resigned after having been appointed in the Education department. However, petitioner was discriminated as one Mandeep Singh Rana son of Rachhpal Singh, who too was working as ETT teacher with the respondent and had resigned, was granted arrears on account of revision of pay. And the similar benefit was extended to many other ETT teachers, who too were equally circumstanced as the petitioner. Petitioner purports to have represented to the respondents repeatedly in this regard, but to no avail. So much so, respondent No.3 was even served upon a legal notice dated 07.11.2014 (Annexure P5), but that too has failed to evoke any response.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that let this petition, at this stage, be disposed of only with a direction to respondent No.3, to consider and decide the notice served by the petitioner within a specified time.

That being so, and without expressing any opinion on merits, this petition is disposed of only with a direction to respondent No.3, to consider and decide the claim of the petitioner, as set out in the legal notice dated 07.11.2014 (Annexure P5), strictly in accordance with law, within a period of 3 months from the receipt of certified copy of this order.

Needless to assert, a comprehensive order shall be passed,
assigning reasons in support of the decision arrived at.

May 1, 2015
Rajan

(Arun Palli)
Judge