

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Sr. No.121

Civil Writ Petition No.14800 of 2018
DECIDED ON: June 01, 2018

RANBIR SINGH AND OTHERS

..PETITIONERS

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH

Present: Mr. Sandeep Kotla, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

JASPAL SINGH, J. (ORAL)

Through the instant civil writ petition, preferred under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, petitioners have sought issuance of a writ especially in the nature of certiorari for quashing the impugned action of the respondents whereby despite the order passed by this Court in CWP No.9347 of 2016 titled as ***Jagat Singh Yadav vs. State of Haryana & ors.*** decided on 20.02.2017 (P-9), the benefit of Selection Grade of Rs.7500-12000 has been granted to the petitioners w.e.f. 01.08.2000 instead of 01.01.1996 for the post of Lecturers as per Government of Haryana vide letter dated 12.12.2000 (P-1), vide which Head Masters of Government High Schools and 20% cadre posts of Lecturers have been granted Selection Grade w.e.f. 01.08.2000 but now Head Master have been granted pay scale of Rs.7500-12000 w.e.f. 01.01.1996 instead of 01.08.2000 in compliance with direction given by this Court in CWP No.8082 of 2001 titled as R.K. Verma and Ors Vs. State of Haryana & anr., allowed on 01.12.2010 (P-2), LPA No.951 of 2011 titled as ***State of Haryana & ors. vs. R.K. Verma &***

Civil Writ Petition No.14800 of 2018

ors., dismissed on 31.10.2012 (P-3), SLP of the State of Haryana dismissed on 01.11.2013 and even the review petition also dismissed by the Hon'ble Apex Court on 02.12.2014 and issue is already settled that the pay anomaly has to be removed from the date of inception WITH FURTHER direction to the respondents to grant benefit of Selection Grade to them w.e.f. 01.01.1996 instead of 01.08.2000 with all consequential benefits.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that though a legal notice was made to the respondents on 16.05.2018 (P-10) but till date neither any response to the said legal notice has been received nor any final order has been passed by the respondents thereon. He further submits that they feel satisfied in case a direction is issued to respondents to decide the aforesaid legal notice (P-10) in view of judgment rendered in **Jagat Singh Yadav's case (supra)**, in a time bound manner.

4. Instant petition is disposed of with a direction to respondents to look into the grievances unfolded by the petitioners in the legal notice dated 16.05.2018 (P-10) and to take a conscious decision by passing a speaking order particularly in the light of the judgment rendered in **Jagat Singh Yadav's case (supra)**, within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

5. However, if petitioners still feel aggrieved by any of the orders passed by the aforesaid authority, they shall be at liberty to have recourse to the other remedies available under law as well as to approach this Court.

June 01, 2018

Ankur

**(JASPAL SINGH)
JUDGE**

**Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable**

**Yes
Yes/No**