

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

CWP-3810-2012 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 24.04.2018

Satpal Singh

... Petitioner

Vs.

Bhakra Beas Management Board and others

... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P.B. BAJANTHRI

Present : Mr. B.D. Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sachin Mittal, Advocate
for the respondents.

P.B. BAJANTHRI J. (Oral)

In the instant petition, petitioner has challenged the decision of the respondent dated 11.10.2010 (Annexure P-3) by which petitioner's claim for removal of pay anomaly on par with one Shri Madhu Sudan, Foreman had been rejected.

2. Perusal of Annexure P-1 service particulars between the petitioner and Shri Madhu Sudan, it is evident that service particulars of both the petitioner and Shri Madhu Sudan are not identical upto 19.01.1998 and on 20.01.1998, petitioner was promoted to the post of Chargeman Grade-II. Whereas Shri Madhu Sudan was not promoted. Shri Madhu Sudan Foreman was extended the benefit of second time bound scale on 16.5.1999. Question of extended the benefit of second time bound scale to the petitioner do not arise. Moreover as on 20.1.1998 the date on which petitioner was promoted to the post of Chargeman Grade-II, service particulars of the petitioner and Shri Madhu Sudan cannot be compared so as to point out that there is a pay anomaly and petitioner is entitled to stepping up of pay. For stepping up of pay service particulars of senior and junior must be identical. In the present case, service particulars of the

petitioner and one Shri Madhu Sudan are not identical from 20.01.1998 onwards. Consequently, there is no infirmity in the communication dated 11.10.2010 (Annexure P-3). Thus, petitioner has not made out a case for seeking stepping up of pay on par with Shri Madhu Sudan.

3. Accordingly, petition stands dismissed.

24.04.2018
rajeev

(P.B. Bajanthri)
Judge

Whether speaking/reasoned **Yes/No**

Whether reportable **Yes/No**