

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

110

Regular Second Appeal No.4717 of 2013 (O&M)
Date of Decision: October 07, 2015

Shingara Singh

...Appellant

Versus

The Punjab State Electricity Board and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASI

Present: Mr. Pawan Kumar Goklaney, Advocate
for the appellant.

AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASI, J. (ORAL)

Counsel for the appellant contends that the judgment dated 22.08.2013 passed by the Lower Appellate Court although relies upon the judgment of the Supreme Court passed in case titled as ***M.R. Gupta Versus Union of India 1995 (4) RSJ 502*** to grant the benefit to the petitioner, however, the re-fixation of the pay has not been ordered from the date of his entitlement.

This contention of learned counsel for the appellant in the considered view of this Court is misconstrued as according to the judgment of the Supreme Court in **M.R. Gupta's** case (supra), on which reliance has been placed, it is clear that the pay fixation will be from the date of entitlement and only arrears will be restricted, which has been done by the Lower Appellate Court.

In view of the above, the present appeal stands disposed of.

October 07, 2015
Puneet

(AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASI)
JUDGE