

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

**CM No.3488 of 2016 in/and
CWP No.15924 of 2011
Date of Decision:-25.07.2018**

Dilbag Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

Punjab State Power Corporation Limited, Patiala and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present:- Ms. Sonia G. Singh, Advocate
for the applicant-petitioner.

Mr. Vikash Chatrath, Advocate with
Ms. Mandeep Kaur, Advocate
for the respondents.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN J.(Oral)

CM No.3488 of 2016

With the consent of the parties, the application is allowed and
the main case is taken up on today's Board.

CWP No.15924 of 2011

By way of instant writ petition, under Article 226 of the
Constitution of India, the petitioner seeks issuance of directions to the
respondents to grant him the benefit of promotional increment(s), in view of
dated 23.04.1990 (Annexure P-1) issued by Deputy Secretary, Finance,
Punjab Government.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the case of the petitioner is squarely covered by the ratio of law laid down by this Court in CWP-20139-2015 titled as **Chiman Singh Vs. Punjab State Power Corporation and others**, decided on 29.02.2016, whereby, the similarly placed persons were granted the benefit as prayed for in the present writ petition(s).

Learned counsel for the respondents do not controvert the assertion raised on behalf of the petitioner.

Heard, learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

A perusal of the record would reveal that in **Chiman Singh's case (supra)**, the order so passed is being covered by the decision of this Court rendered in LPA-883-2012, decided on 03.07.2012 which has attained finality with dismissal of SLP-20468-2012. Since, the similarly situated persons have been granted the benefit in Chiman Singh's case (supra), therefore, the petitioner(s) cannot be deprived of the relief sought. The arrears shall be restricted up to to 38 months from the date of filing of the petition(s) in view of the ratio of law laid down in **Saroj Kumari Vs. State of Punjab**, 1998(3) SCT 664 wherein it has been observed as under:-

“9. After hearing learned Counsel for the parties on this point we are of the view that in case where a person invokes the jurisdiction of this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for fixation of his pay under relevant rules/instructions or even on the basis of a judgment of a competent Court, the question of delay and laches would not come in as it would be a

case of a continuing wrong and every month the person is paid the salary which according to him is not in accordance with the relevant rules and instructions a fresh cause of action would arise every month. Such a case is not a case of one time action like the case of termination or dismissal from service. As observed by the Apex Court in M. R. Gupta's case (supra) that the Court while granting relief regarding the payment of arrears may apply law of limitation. Since a Civil Suit would be maintainable for realizing arrears of three years and two months, the writ Court would be justified in restricting the payment of arrears to three years and two months prior to the filing of the writ petition.

10. We do not agree with the submission of the learned Advocate General, Punjab, that the writ Court should decline the relief to a person who is claiming correct fixation of his pay in accordance with the relevant rules and instructions merely because he has been negligent in approaching the Court. If such a person can file a civil suit for the correct fixation of his pay where he can further claim arrears up to a period of three years and two months prior to the Filing of the civil suit, there is no reason why such relief should be denied by a writ Court. Apart from the above, it may be noticed that in such cases as the present one where only fixation of pay is sought and arrears are claimed, rights of third party do not intervene during the period the person may not have approached the Court. The correct fixation of pay and the payment of arrears do not affect third party's right. This was also so observed by the Division Bench in Rattan Singh's case which has been quoted above, on the basis of which the argument

was raised by the learned Advocate General Punjab.

11. For the foregoing reasons we are of the view that in cases where only fixation of pay according the relevant rules/instructions or a judgment is prayed for, the writ petition cannot be dismissed at the threshold on the ground of delay and laches but the payment of arrears can be restricted to a reasonable period. Three years and two months would be considered a reasonable period as that is the period for which a person can ask for the payment of arrears before a Civil Court.”

Accordingly, the writ petition is allowed in terms of **Chiman Singh's case (supra)**. The respondents are directed to treat the petitioner at par with the petitioner(s) in **Chiman Singh's case** and consider the claim of the petitioner in the light of the said case and pass the consequential order within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

July 25, 2018
Vijay Asija

(**JITENDRA CHAUHAN**)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes / No
Yes / No