

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

Sr. No.217

(1)

CWP No.19390 of 2014

Vijay Kumar and others

....Petitioners

versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

(2)

CWP No.22788 of 2015

Yudhvir Singh and others

....Petitioners

versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

(3)

CWP No.23415 of 2014

Om Parkash Verma and another

....Petitioners

versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

(4)

CWP No.21496 of 2014

Surender Kumar and others

....Petitioners

versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

(5)

CWP No.26113 of 2014

Pawan Kumar and others

....Petitioners

versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

(6)

CWP No.1104 of 2015

Jasbir Singh and others

....Petitioners

versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

(7)

CWP No.3311 of 2015

Shamsher Singh and others

....Petitioners

versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

(8)

CWP No.5411 of 2015

Rohtash Kumar and others

....Petitioners

versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

(9)

CWP No.5888 of 2015

Mohinder Singh and others

....Petitioners

versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

(10)

CWP No.698 of 2015

Niranjan Dev Sharma and others

....Petitioners

versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

(11)

CWP No.14385 of 2015

Ram Kumar Malik and others

....Petitioners

versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

(12)

CWP No.14388 of 2015

Rakesh Kumar and others

....Petitioners

versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

(13)

CWP No.17277 of 2015

Om Parkash and others

....Petitioners

versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

(14)

CWP No.20232 of 2015

Prakash Chandra Gupta and others

....Petitioners

versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

(15)

CWP No.24273 of 2015

Dilbagh Singh and others

....Petitioners

versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

(16)

CWP No.988 of 2016

Sube Singh and others

....Petitioners

versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

(17)

CWP No.26450 of 2015

Manoj Bhardwaj and others

....Petitioners

versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

Date of decision: 12.02.2016

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL

* * *

To be referred to Reporters or not?

Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest?

* * *

Present: Mr. Arun Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Ms. Shruti Jain Goyal, AAG, Haryana.

* * *

DEEPAK SIBAL, J.(Oral)

A bunch of 17 writ petitions being **C.W.P. Nos.19390, 21496, 23415, 26113 of 2014, 698, 1104, 3311, 5411, 5888, 14385, 14388, 17277 20232, 22788, 24273, 26450 of 2015 and 988 of 2016,** involving similar issues of fact and law were heard together and being disposed of through the present common judgment. For the sake of convenience, facts have been taken from **C.W.P. No.19390 of 2014** titled as **'Vijay Kumar and others vs. State of Haryana and others'**.

The petitioners who are serving as Instructors/Group Instructors/Principal Group-B in the department of Technical Education Industrial Training, Government of Haryana, on the basis of instructions dated 12.12.2011 were granted revision in their pay scales which through the impugned orders have been retrospectively withdrawn admittedly without grant of any opportunity of hearing or notice to them.

A perusal of the orders further shows that they are bereft of any reason.

The revised pay scales in which the petitioners had been placed cannot be taken away and that too retrospectively without any notice and grant of opportunity of hearing to them. Further, the same could only be done by passing a reasoned order.

In view of the above, while quashing the impugned orders in each of the petitions being **C.W.P. Nos.19390, 21496, 23415, 26113 of 2014, 698, 1104, 3311, 5411, 5888, 14385, 14388, 17277 20232, 22788, 24273, 26450 of 2015 and 988 of 2016**, all these writ petitions are allowed.

However, respondents are at liberty to proceed against the petitioners after following the principles of natural justice and in case they have to pass an order prejudicing the rights of the petitioners, the same should be a well-reasoned order after considering all pleas raised by them.

(DEEPAK SIBAL)
JUDGE

February 12, 2016
Jyoti 1