

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

CWP No. 15085 of 2012 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 09.03.2017

GIAN CHAND

... *Petitioner*

VS.

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

...*Respondents*

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present: Mr. H.S. Saini, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Anshul Gupta, AAG, Punjab.

KULDIP SINGH, J. (Oral)

In compliance of the last order dated 31.01.2017 passed by this Court in the present case, Sh. K.C. Bhagat, Executive Engineer, Dam Construction, and Spillway Construction Division, RSD-Shahpurkandi Township has appeared alongwith record and copy of the pay fixation of the petitioner which is already on record as (Annexure R-6). The perusal of the same shows that vide endorsement of order dated 09.12.2016, the pay of the petitioner was re-fixed. On 05.02.1988, he was granted seven retrenchment increments in place of eight increments granted inadvertently, raising his pay from ₹ 770/- to ₹910/-. Thereafter, two special increments were granted to the petitioner w.e.f. 01.06.1989, raising his pay from ₹930/- to ₹975/-. The annual increment at that time was granted @ ₹20. Another special increment was also granted to the petitioner w.e.f. 05.02.1992 raising his pay from ₹1025/- to ₹1050/- i.e. @ ₹ 25/-.

CWP No. 15085 of 2012 (O&M)

The contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner is that the pay of the petitioner has actually been reduced on account of re-fixation of pay.

It comes out that on 01.01.1996 revised pay scales were released. Note against the entry dated 01.08.2000 shows that the proficiency step up on account of completion of eighty years of service was withdrawn on account of the fact that the petitioner was granted special increments during the year 1995 and retired from service on 30.06.2001. The last pay of the petitioner was 4550/-. In this way, it is clear that seven retrenchment increments have already been granted to the petitioner. Therefore, claim of the petitioner stands satisfied as correct pay of the petitioner is being re-fixed.

The petition is disposed of as rendered infructuous.

Needless to say that if necessary the pension shall also be revised according to the last pay drawn by the petitioner.

March 9, 2017

Suresh Kumar

**[KULDIP SINGH]
JUDGE**

<i>Whether speaking / reasoned</i>	:	✓ Yes	/	No ✓
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	:	Yes	/	No