

103

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

CWP-18671-2017

Date of decision-26.02.2018

Veena Rani and another

...Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. Raman Goklaney, Advocate for the petitioners.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J. (Oral)

This writ petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India has been filed for the issuance of a writ, in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to revise and re-affix the salary/pay-scales of the petitioners and they be given salary and benefits at par with the Supervisors directly recruited and working with respondent No.2.

Contentends that case of the petitioners is squarely covered a judgment passed by this Court in CWP-9497-2014 and other connected matters titled as “Narinder Kaur Vs. State of Punjab and others” decided on 28.07.2016 (Annexure P-9). Further, he states that at this stage he would be satisfied, if a direction is issued to respondent No.2- Director, Department of Social Security and Women & Child Development, First Floor, Sector- 34-A, Chandigarh to consider and decide the legal notice dated 23.02.2017 (Annexure P-8) in the light of Annexure P-9.

Heard.

In view of the above, without advertng to the merits of the case, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2- Director, Department of Social Security and Women & Child Development, First Floor, Sector- 34-A, Chandigarh to consider and decide the legal notice dated 23.02.2017 (Annexure P-8) in the light of Annexure P-9 within six weeks from the receipt of the certified copy of the order. In case, on consideration, the competent authority reaches to the conclusion that the benefit claimed by the petitioners is admissible to them, in such eventuality, the consequential relief be allowed to them, 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.

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

26.02.2018
vanita

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