

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 9199 of 2017
Date of decision: 10.08.2017

Mahavir Singh and others

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE G.S.SANDHAWALIA

Present: Mr. Ravinder Malik, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

G.S.SANDHAWALIA, J. (Oral)

The petitioners seek equal pay for equal work as paid to regular employees holding the same post in view of the judgment in *State of Punjab and others vs. Jagjit Singh and others, 2016 (4) SCT 641*. It is their case that they were appointed as ALMs in the year 2008 and were being paid as per D.C. Rates and resultantly claim minimum of pay scale on their post in view of the abovesaid judgment.

It is not disputed that representation has only been made on 11.01.2017 (Annexure P-9) to the respondents and the same is still pending consideration. Counsel further submits that he would be satisfied if a direction is issued to the respondents to decide the said representation within a fixed time frame.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Harish Rathee, Sr. DAG, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of respondents no. 1, 4 and 5 and Mr. Sandeep Moudgil, Advocate accepts notice on behalf of respondents no. 2 and 3-Nigam at the asking of the Court. Copy of the writ petition has been supplied to them.

Without commenting on the merits of the case or the entitlement of the petitioners for the abovesaid relief and keeping in view the fact that the matter is still pending consideration, the present writ petition is disposed of with direction to respondent-Nigam to take a decision on the said representation dated 11.01.2017 (Annexure P-9) within a period

of 4 months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the order. Needless to say if the benefit is to be declined, a reasoned order be passed and the same be conveyed to the petitioners.

10.08.2017
shivani

(G.S. SANDHAWALIA)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No

