

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

CWP No. 4140 of 2016
Date of decision: 02.03.2016

Joginder KaurPetitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and others ...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE G.S.SANDHAWALIA

Present: Mr. Pawan Kumar, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

G.S.SANDHAWALIA, J. (Oral)

The petitioner seeks quashing of the letter dated 19.01.2016 (Annexure P-6) whereby, as per para no. 1(2), respondent no. 3 has noticed that the benefit of 3 advance increments which had been given on 01.01.1978 as JBT Giani had been restored to the petitioner. However, even then, an objection was put that if the petitioner had earlier been a litigant, the copy of the writ petition alongwith decision and speaking order of the competent authority be sent, failing which, her pay was liable to be refixed according to the Punjab Government Rules. The petitioner has relied upon the report of the Officers' Committee dated 23.11.2011 (Annexure P-7) whereby, 3 advance increments given from the date of joining service but prior to 19.02.1989 were permissible. Reference is also made to instructions dated 01.02.2011 (Annexure P-8) whereby, the report of the Officers' Committee was circulated so that the case of all persons could be disposed of in terms of the orders passed by the Officers' Committee. Similarly, reference is also made to the order passed in *CWP*

No. 13126 of 2012, Lakhwinder Kaur and others vs. State of Punjab and

others decided on 21.01.2016 (Annexure P-9) wherein, directions were issued to the competent authority to consider and decide the case of the petitioner in the light of the report of the Officers' Committee within 30 days from the date of receipt of certified copy.

Counsel submits that he would be satisfied if his case is also disposed of in the same terms.

Notice of motion.

Mr. R.S. Sidhu, AAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the respondents. Copy of the writ petition has been supplied to him.

Keeping in view the limited relief sought, this Court does not feel it necessary for the respondents to file reply.

Accordingly, without commenting on the merits of the case, this writ petition is disposed of in the same terms as *Lakhwinder Kaur's case (supra)*, for decision by the competent authority.

02.03.2016
shivani

(G.S. SANDHAWALIA)
JUDGE