

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

CWP No.913 of 2016

Date of Decision:18.01.2016

Gurnam Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

The Punjab State Cooperative Supply and
Marketing Federation Limited & anr.

... Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV NARAIN RAINA

Present: Mr. Amit Sharma, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

1. To be referred to the Reporters or not?
2. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

RAJIV NARAIN RAINA, J.(Oral)

The Coordinate Bench has passed the following order in
CWP No.657 of 2016(Manohar Lal v. Punjab State Cooperative Supply
& Marketing Federation Ltd. & anr.) decided on 14.1.2016, where the
similar issue was involved:-

“The petitioner seeks a direction for refixation of his
basic pay, in consonance with the terms and conditions
of the merger order dated 24.12.2008 (Annexure P1),
passed by respondent No.2.

It is the case of the petitioner that he was working
with the Giddarbaha Cooperative Marketing Society
Ltd., District Muktsar, which was merged with
respondent No.1. In pursuance of the said merger,
respondent No.1 passed the order dated 20.02.2009
(Annexure P2) whereby the petitioner's basic pay was
fixed at Rs.10,025/-, on merger. Thereafter, his pay was
wrongly fixed on 11.05.2009 (Annexure P3) and
01.10.2010 (Annexure P4), at an amount lower than the
one which had already been fixed. He had filed

representation dated 28.10.2010(Annexure P5) for correction of his pay fixation and for restoration of his basic pay from Rs.9,475/- to Rs.10,025/-, w.e.f., 20.02.2009 and for releasing the arrears of pay along with interest. The petitioner has, now, retired on 31.12.2012.

Counsel for the petitioner submits that in similar circumstances, this Court in *CWP-14036-2010 titled Gurdial Singh Vs. Punjab State Cooperative Supply & Marketing Federation Ltd. (Markfed)*, decided on 28.03.2012 (Annexure P6), has set aside the orders whereby the basic pay had been reduced. It is further pointed out that directions have also been issued to decide the representations, in various cases and necessary reliefs have been granted to the said employee and reference is made to the case of Darshana Rani widow of Late Ram Chand (Annexures P7 & P8). He submits that the petitioner would be satisfied, at this stage, if a time-bound direction is given to the respondents to decide the representations dated 28.10.2010 (Annexure P5) and 28.10.2015 (Annexure P9).

Keeping in view the limited controversy involved, this Court does not feel it necessary to call upon the respondents to file reply.

Accordingly, without commenting upon the merits of the case, the present writ petition is disposed of, with a direction to respondent No.1 to decide the representations dated 28.10.2010 (Annexure P5) and 28.10.2015 (Annexure P9), within a period of 3 months from the receipt of a certified copy of this order. In case the petitioner is found entitled for the said relief, the financial benefits be disbursed to him, within a period of 1 month, thereafter. In case the benefit is to be denied, a reasoned order be passed and the same be conveyed to the petitioner.”

Accordingly, this petition is also disposed of in the same terms as in CWP No.657 of 2016.

(RAJIV NARAIN RAINA)
JUDGE

18.1.2016
monika