

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

CWP No. 7442 of 2016
Date of decision: 25.04.2016

Prem Verma

....Petitioner(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 the revision of pension without withdrawal of the benefit of 3 increments which were granted to her at the time of her appointment on account of her possessing the qualification of Giani. The relief is claimed on the basis of the Officer's Committee constituted in pursuance of the directions issued by this Court which submitted a report that the 3 increments be allowed to such employees. Counsel for the petitioner points out that vide communication dated 29.06.2010 (Annexure P-6), the pension revision case of the petitioner was returned on account of the instructions dated 21.04.2009 whereby, the 3 advance increments were not admissible to JBT Teachers having higher qualifications of Giani/Prabhakar if the retirees were working in the primary school.

It is submitted that representation dated 18.10.2015 (Annexure P-9) has been filed in view of the Officer's Committee report dated 23.11.2011 (Annexure P-7) in favour of the employees and, therefore, the petitioner is entitled to the said benefits. Reliance is also placed upon the

directions issued in *CWP No. 13126 of 2012, Lakhwinder Kaur and others vs. State of Punjab and others* decided on 21.01.2016 (Annexure P-10) followed in *CWP No. 4140 of 2016, Joginder Kaur vs. State of Punjab and others*, decided on 02.03.2016 (Annexure P-11).

Counsel submits that he would be satisfied if his representation dated 18.10.2015 (Annexure P-9) is 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.

25.04.2016
shivani

(G.S. SANDHAWALIA)
JUDGE