

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

1. CWP No.5900 of 2002 (O&M)
Date of decision : 4.2.2019

Sunita Singla and others

...Petitioners

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

2. CWP No.10980 of 2002 (O&M)

Ashok Kumar and others

..Petitioners

Vs.

State of Haryana and another

..Respondents

3. CWP No.12269 of 2002 (O&M)

Kamlesh Kumari and others

..Petitioners

Vs.

State of Haryana and another

..Respondent

4. CWP No.12324 of 2002 (O&M)

Rohtash Khatri and others

..Petitioners

Vs.

State of Haryana and another

..Respondents

CWP No.5900 of 2002 -2-

5. CWP No.13287 of 2002 (O&M)
Rattan Singh and others

..Petitioners

Vs.

State of Haryana and another

..Respondents

6. CWP No.2374 of 2003 (O&M)

Attar Singh and others

..Petitioners

Vs.

State of Haryana and another

..Respondents

7. CWP No.9795 of 2002 (O&M)

Jagdish and others

..Petitioners

Vs.

State of Haryana and another

..Respondents

8. CWP No.9844 of 2002 (O&M)

Dharampal and others

..Petitioners

Vs.

State of Haryana and another

..Respondent

9. CWP No.9993 of 2002 (O&M)

Deen Dayal Sharma and others

..Petitioners

Vs.

State of Haryana and another

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV NARAIN RAINA

Present: Ms.Manjeet Kaur, Advocate for
Mr.S.K.Malik, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Ms.Shruti Jain Goyal, DAG Haryana.

RAJIV NARAIN RAINA, J. (ORAL)

This order will dispose of nine cases bearing CWP Nos.5900, 10980, 12269, 12324, 13287, 9795, 9844, 9992 of 2002 and 2374 of 2003 as common issue is involved therein which can be decided by a similar order.

This matter is squarely covered by the decision in ***CWP No.6305 of 2009, Parmod Kumar and others Versus State of Haryana and others*** decided on 17.9.2018. The petitioners have sought counting of their ad hoc service towards higher standard pay scales which issue is covered by para 43(iii) in the aforesaid judgment. Consequently, the petitioners are not entitled to the benefit of financial upgradation of higher standard scale for the period of their ad hoc service. Only regular service rendered satisfactorily counts for claiming rights to this monetary benefit strictly within the framework of the Scheme.

As a result, all the petitions are dismissed.

4.2.2019
Meenu

(RAJIV NARAIN RAINA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

:

Yes/No

Whether reportable

:

Yes/No