

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

220

**CWP No. 12451 of 2012 (O&M)
Date of decision: 14.07.2016**

Narayan Singh

.... Petitioner

Versus

Union of India and others

.... Respondents

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice P.B. Bajanthri

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

Present: Mr. Rajeev Anand, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Saurabh Goel, Advocate for the respondents-UOI.

P.B. Bajanthri, J.(Oral)

In the present petition, the petitioner has questioned the order dated 17.02.2010 Annexure P-3 and order dated 08.06.2011 Annexure P5.

The petitioner was appointed as an Inspector/Hindi Translator on 14.09.1996. With reference to the policy, Assured Career Progression Scheme was granted certain monetary benefits on 29.07.2008 w.e.f 14.09.2008 as Ist ACP. On 17.2.2010, the respondents have taken a decision that petitioner has been granted ACP contrary to the scheme and he is eligible with reference to modified ACP Scheme and thereafter, order dated 08.06.2011 has been issued for justification of the impugned action to modify the grant of ACP benefit. It is admitted that the impugned action

CWP No. 12451 of 2012 (O&M)

-2-

dated 17.02.2010 and 08.06.2011 are without hearing the petitioner. On this short ground, orders dated 17.02.2010 and 08.06.2011 are liable to be set aside. However, this order will not come in the way of taking fresh action by the respondents after giving opportunity of hearing. Accordingly, CWP is allowed.

14.07.2016

pooja saini

(P.B.BAJANTHRI)
JUDGE