

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

(1) **COCP No.139 of 2013 (O&M)**

Harbhajan Singh and othersPetitioners

Versus

Ravneet Kaur and others ...Respondents

(2) **COCP No.2098 of 2013 (O&M)**

Harbans Singh and othersPetitioners

Versus

Ravneet Kaur and another ...Respondents

(3) **COCP No.692 of 2014 (O&M)**

Kulwant Singh Pannu and othersPetitioners

Versus

Dr. Roshan Sunkaria and others ...Respondents

(4) **COCP No.691 of 2014 (O&M)**

Sudesh Kumari and anotherPetitioners

Versus

Dr. Roshan Sunkaria and others ...Respondents

Date of decision : 08.11.2017

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE DAYA CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Sanjeev Pandit, Advocate and
Mr. Vivek Sharma, Advocate for the petitioners.

Ms. Sudeepti Sharma, Addl. A. G. Punjab.

* * *

DAYA CHAUDHARY, J. (Oral)

Learned counsel for the respondents submits that as per the direction issued by this Court on 15.05.2012, the petitioners were granted pay scale of ₹2200-4000 at par with DPEs, old Coaches and Lecturers in Government Colleges and they were given notional increases in scales from the date when DPEs were placed in the said scale. Learned counsel also submits that arrears will also be paid.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that although the pay scale of ₹2200-4000 at par with DPEs, old Coaches and Lecturers in Government Colleges have been granted but they have not been granted senior scale selection grade, whereas the same have been granted to said categories as mentioned above.

On perusal of the order and the contentions raised by the counsel for the petitioners, it is evident that they are claiming parity in pay scales with DPEs, old Coaches and Lecturers in Government Colleges. Some benefits have been released but the consequential benefits out of said grade have not been granted to the petitioners. Meaning thereby, in case petitioners are at par with said categories and are also entitled for other consequential benefits as well.

Learned counsel for the respondents submits that criteria for

grant of selection grade is different and there was no specific direction.

However, the petitioners are at liberty to move representation to the respondent-authorities for grant of consequential benefits at par with other categories. In case such representation is moved by the petitioners within a period of one month from today, the respondent-authorities are directed to consider and decide the same within a period of two months thereafter. The petitioners if found to be entitled to the relief claimed in such representation, the same be granted to them within a period of two months thereafter. In case they are not found entitled, the respondent-authorities are directed to pass a speaking and well reasoned order by considering the averments made in the representation. In case, the personal hearing of the petitioners is required, the same be given.

In case the petitioners are still aggrieved in any manner by the orders passed by the respondents, they are at liberty to avail the appropriate remedy.

The present contempt petitions are disposed of accordingly.

Photocopy of this order be placed on file of other connected cases.

08.11.2017

sunil yadav

**(DAYA CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes / No

Whether reportable : Yes / No