

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

**CWP No.14629 of 2016
Date of decision: 25.07.2016**

Balbinder Singh and others

..Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE DAYA CHAUDHARY

Present: Mr. Amrik Singh, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Daya Chaudhary, J. (Oral)

This writ petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing of letter dated 23.05.2014 (Annexure P-7), whereby, a condition has been imposed that the retired officials will not be paid equal to regular scale and they will be entitled for fixed pay for the time being.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that vide letter dated 08.05.2014 (Annexure P-6), salary equal to minimum of regular pay scale was granted but subsequently, only because of letter dated 23.05.2014 (Annexure P-7), the petitioners are not being paid salary equal to regular scale whereas the employees doing the same nature of job, are getting higher salary. Learned counsel also submits that the petitioners have made representation and even served legal notice but no action has been taken thereupon so far. The petitioners would be satisfied in case, directions are issued by this Court to decide the representation dated 15.03.2016 (Annexure P-8) as well as legal notice dated 01.07.2016 (Annexure P-9).

Keeping in view the limited prayer of the petitioners and without commenting anything on the merits of the case, the present writ petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2 to consider representation dated 15.03.2016 (Annexure P-8) as well as legal notice dated 01.07.2016 (Annexure P-9) and take necessary action in accordance with law and policy within a period of two months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

In case, the petitioners are found to be entitled to the relief claimed, the same be granted to them within a period of two months thereafter and in case, any adverse order is passed, the petitioners are at liberty to challenge the same.

25.07.2016
neetu

(DAYA CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	✓ Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No