

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

CWP-16161 of 2013

Date of decision: 18.07.2019

Kundan Lal and others Petitioners

versus

State of Haryana and others Respondents

CWP-3683 of 2015

Ashok Kumar and others Petitioners

versus

State of Haryana and others Respondents

CWP-31282 of 2018

Tara Chand and others Petitioners

versus

State of Haryana and others Respondents

CWP-32203 of 2018

Raj Kumar Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana and others Respondents

CWP-31130 of 2018

Ram Naresh and another Petitioners

versus

State of Haryana and others Respondents

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. Saurabh Bajaj, Advocate
for the petitioner (s).

Ms. Safia Gupta, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. R.S. Cheema, Advocate
for respondent No.3.

Mr. R.S. Dadwal, Advocate with
Ms. Aman Chaudhary, Advocate for
respondents No.3 and 6 in CWP-3683 of 2015.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J.

By this common order, the above mentioned five writ petitions are being disposed of as the same question of law and similar facts is involved therein.

The grievance which is being raised by the petitioner in these writ petitions is for the grant of pay scale to the Lab Attendants, who are not matriculate, equivalent to the pay scale, which was extended to the matriculate Lab Attendants, who are working in the Aided Institutions.

Counsel for the petitioner (s) argues that the similar discrimination was also in the Government institutions, where the non-matriculate Lab Attendants were being paid less than the Lab Attendants, having qualification of matriculation. The said discrimination was removed by this Court while deciding CWP-3901 of 1988 on 29.07.2008.

Counsel for the respondents states that grievance of the petitioners has already been redressed and benefit of same pay scale as being granted to the matriculate Lab Attendants has been extended to the petitioners as well and she produces copy of order by which the same benefit has been extended to the petitioners also. The benefit of grant of pay scale has been extended notionally and arrears were restricted to three years and two months.

Counsel for the petitioners states that the said order by which the

benefit of arrears has been declined to the petitioner needs to be challenged by the petitioner. He prays that he be allowed to withdraw all the above five writ petitions with liberty to file fresh one challenging the denial of the arrears to the petitioners, which has already been extended to the similar employees, who were granted the benefit by this Court while deciding CWP-3901 of 1988.

All the writ petitions are dismissed as withdrawn with liberty as prayed for.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

18.07.2019
aarti

- | | | |
|----|--------------------------------|--------|
| 1. | Whether speaking/non-speaking? | Yes/No |
| 2. | Whether reportable? | Yes/No |