

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

CWP-8542-2018

Date of decision-05.04.2018

Inderjit Singh and others

Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Ms. Natasha Munjal, Advocate for
Mr. M.K.Dogra, Advocate for the petitioners.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J.

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 pay arrears of difference of pay after restoration of 4 special increments in accordance with the judgment in LPA-1161-2009 (Annexure P-8) as modified by Hon'ble the Supreme Court in SLP (C) 13027-2011 decided on 16.07.2014 (Annexure P-9).

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners states that at this stage she would be satisfied, if a direction is issued to respondent No.2 to consider and decide the claim of the petitioners in the light of judgment passed by this Court in LPA-1161-2009 (Annexure P-8) and judgment passed by Hon'ble the Supreme Court in SLP (C)-13027-2011 decided on 16.07.2014 (Annexure P-9) where relief to the extent of restoration of 4 special increments have already been allowed. However, the

difference of the arrears have not been paid. It is asserted that for redressal of the grouse, the petitioners submitted representation dated 12.07.2017 (Annexure P-11), however, the same has not been acted upon.

Heard.

In view of the above, without adverting to the merits of the case, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2- Chief Engineer, Ranjit Sagar Dam, Shahpurkandi Township, Tehsil & District Pathankot to consider and decide the representation dated 12.07.2017 (Annexure P-11) in the light of Annexures P-8 and P-9 expeditiously at this stage. 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 to them or made out, in that case, a speaking order be passed in the matter.

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

05.04.2018

vanita

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