

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

CWP No.14185 of 2018 (O&M)

Date of decision: 30.05.2018

Anoop Singh and others

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Ms. Saguna Arora, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Jitendra Chauhan, J. (Oral)

By way of the present petition, the petitioners seek issuance of directions to the respondents to step up the pay of the petitioners who were appointed in the year 2006 equivalent to their junior employees appointed during the year 2007-08 and they have been granted more pay on account of grant of ACP benefit in the revised pay scale after 01.10.2011, whereas the petitioners were granted ACP benefit under the un-revised pay scale prior to 01.10.2011.

Learned counsel states that at this stage, she would be satisfied in case respondent No.2-Director of Public Instructions (SE), Punjab, Vidya Bhawan, Phase-VIII, SAS Nagar, Mohali is directed to consider and decide the legal notice dated 05.10.2017 (Annexure P-10) in the light of judgments passed by this Court in CWP-8884-2016 titled as **Kiran Sharma and others** Vs. **State of Punjab and others**, decided on 04.11.2016 (Annexure P-7), CWP-28541-2017 titled as **Sahil Bansal and**

others Vs. State of Punjab and another, decided on 15.12.2017 (Annexure P-8) and CWP-29516-2017 titled as Rohit Kumar and others Vs. State of Punjab and another, decided on 21.12.2017 (Annexure P-9) in a time bound manner.

Heard.

In view of the above, without adverting to the merits of the case, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2-Director of Public Instructions (SE), Punjab, Vidya Bhawan, Phase-VIII, SAS Nagar, Mohali to consider the case of the petitioners in the light of assertion made. If, on consideration, the competent authority reaches to the conclusion that the case of the petitioners is at par with the petitioners in the above said judgment, the competent authority is directed to pass the consequential order within a period of six weeks thereafter. However, in case the competent authority feels that the relief claimed by the petitioners is not admissible or made out, in that case, a speaking order be passed in the matter.

30.05.2018

sumit.k

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No