

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

**CWP No.9952 of 2016
Date of decision:19.5.2016**

Pritpal Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab & ors.

... Respondents

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

Present: Mr. RK Arora, 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 prayer in this petition is identical to a bunch of four cases with CWP No.18644 of 2015; Gurmit Singh and others v. State of Punjab and others decided on 11.03.2016 by this Court. Those petitions have been allowed without saddling the respondent department with arrears arising out of refixation of pay/emoluments, by permitting those employees who want to change their option to their advantage w.e.f. 01.01.2006 to 01.11.2006. The petitioner in the present case is praying for change his option to 31.12.1995 from 1.1.1996 enable him to draw annual increment in revised scale. The earlier option exercised by the petitioner has led to an anomaly where persons junior to the petitioner are in receipt of higher pay. Even when Gurmit Singh's case was decided, the dispute was no longer *res integra* and was covered by the decision of the Division Bench of this Court rendered in Randhir Kaur & others Vs. State of Haryana & others; 2003 (2) SCT 240 and a Single Bench decision of this Court in CWP No.7464 of 2009; Surinder Kumar & others Vs. State

of Punjab & others, decided on 25.2.2010.

Since the matter is squarely covered on all fours by judicial precedents, it would not be necessary to obtain view of the Government on an already decided issue.

Be that as it may, let notice of motion issue.

On the asking of this Court, Mr. Nikhil K. Chopra, Additional Advocate General, Punjab appears for the State of Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the State and waives service on them. Mr. Arora has handed over a set of the paper-book to Mr. Chopra in Court. Mr. Chopra has gone through the decision in Gurmit Singh's case and read the prayers in this petition which match. As a result, this petition is allowed in the same terms as Gurmit Singh's case.

(RAJIV NARAIN RAINA)
JUDGE

19.5.2016
monika