

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

CWP-9353-2017

Date of decision: 30.1.2018

Kiranjeet Kaur and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr.SK Rattan, Advocate for the petitioners

Mr.Suveer Sheokand, Addl.AG, Punjab

JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J.

The present writ petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India has been filed for issuance a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to allow the petitioners to change their option for grant of revised pay scales w.e.f. 1.11.2006 instead of their earlier option w.e.f. 1.1.2006 in terms of the Punjab Civil Services (Revised pay Scales) Rules, 2009.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the case of the petitioners is at par with the case of Kishore Kumar and others. In the reply filed by the respondents-State, in CWP -9344-2017 filed by Kishore Kumar and others, it has been averred that vide letter dated 15.3.2017 (Annexure R-1), the claim of such employees have been considered and they have been allowed to change their option in the new pay scale w.e.f. 1.11.2006 instead

of w.e.f. 1.11.2006. He further submits that he does not claim any arrears prior to the filing of the present writ petition and the same may be admissible from the date of the filing of the present petition.

Learned counsel for the respondents-State submits that he has no objection, if the present petition is disposed of in terms of the letter dated 15.3.2017 and the judgment passed in CWP No.9344 of 2017.

In view of the above, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondents-State to consider the case of the petitioners in view of letter dated 15.3.2017 issued by the Department of Finance, Government of Punjab and if they are found to be at par with the petitioners in CWP No.9344 of 2017, necessary relief be allowed to them and also the arrears of the petitioners be calculated from the date of filing of the present petition, as stated by the counsel for the petitioners and be paid within three months from the date of receipt of the certified copy of this judgment. However, if on examination, the competent authority does not find the petitioners to be at par with the petitioners in CWP No.9344 of 2017, then a detailed speaking order be passed.

30.1.2018
gsv

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking / reasoned?

Yes / No

Whether reportable?

Yes / No