

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

Sr. No.241

Civil Writ Petition No.4193 of 2017
DECIDED ON: April 24, 2018

KULWANT KAUR AND OTHERS

..PETITIONERS

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH

Present: None for the petitioners.

Mr. Jaswinder Singh, Senior Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

JASPAL SINGH, J. (ORAL)

Through the instant civil writ petition, preferred under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, petitioners have sought the issuance of a writ particularly in the nature of Certiorari quashing the impugned memo dated 23.11.2011 (P-3) to the extent wherein it has been decided that the services rendered in Classical & Vernacular scale prior to 01.01.1986 shall not be counted for proficiency step up AND FURTHER directing the respondents not to withdraw the benefit of proficiency step up already granted to them in view of the instructions issued by the Government of Punjab from time to time and by issuing ad interim orders, operation of the impugned memo dated 23.11.2011 (P-3) to the extent as indicated above be stayed and the respondents be restrained from withdrawing the benefit of

Civil Writ Petition No.4193 of 2017

proficiency step up already granted to them as far back as in the year 1988-89 be not withdrawn, consequently, the pay of the petitioners be not refixed during the pendency of the writ petition.

2. Learned State counsel has fairly conceded that the impugned memo dated 23.11.2011 (P-3) stands quashed. In view of fact that the relief claimed through the instant petition has already been granted to the petitioner. He further submitted that the similar relief was sought by the petitioners in CWP No.16095 of 2012 captioned as **Baldev Singh & ors. vs. State of Punjab** decided on 16.05.2016, which was allowed on the doctrine of parity. The relief has already been accorded to the petitioners by way of implementation of the aforesaid order dated 16.05.2016 by passing a speaking order dated 12.07.2017 i.e. during the pendency of the instant petition. Since, the relief sought through the instant petition has already granted to the petitioners and instant petition has rendered infructuous and is disposed of as such.

3. However, if the petitioner(s) still feel(s) aggrieved of the order dated 12.07.2017 or any other ground connected with the passing of the aforesaid order, he/they shall be at liberty to approach this Court or to have recourse to other remedies available under law.

April 24, 2018

Ankur

**(JASPAL SINGH)
JUDGE**

**Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable**

**Yes
Yes/No**