

1.

...Respondents

...Respondents

...Respondents

...Respondents

CWP-26916-2014 and other connected cases		2
5.	CWP-1304-2015(O&M)	
Dr. Gurvinderjit Singh and others		...Petitioners
	Vs.	
State of Punjab and others		...Respondents
6.	CWP-20001-2015(O&M)	
Balvinder Singh and others		...Petitioners
	Vs.	
State of Punjab and others		...Respondents
7.	CWP-337-2015(O&M)	
Onkar Nath and others		...Petitioners
	Vs.	
State of Punjab and others		...Respondents
8.	CWP-346-2015(O&M)	
Subhash Chander and others		...Petitioners
	Vs.	
State of Punjab and others		...Respondents
9.	CWP-347-2015(O&M)	
Amar Singh and others		...Petitioners
	Vs.	
State of Punjab and others		...Respondents

10. CWP-2210-2015(O&M)

Pargat Singh and others

...Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

11. CWP-13666-2015(O&M)

Avinash Kumar and others

...Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. Vikas Chatrath, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) (in CWP-25748-2015).

Mr. Salil Sabhlok, Advocate and
Mr. Sourabh Arora, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) in the remaining petitions.

Mr. Navdeep Chhabra, D.A.G., Punjab.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J.

This judgment shall dispose of the aforementioned eleven petitions as common questions of law and fact are involved therein.

These writ petitions under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India have been filed seeking quashing of impugned order dated 20.07.2013 (Annexure P-5) passed by the Officers' Committee under the chairmanship of respondent No.1 and further directing the respondents to grant all the benefits of the period of service rendered by the petitioners w.e.f. the date of their initial appointment in the year 1994 & 1995

including benefits for the purpose of reckoning seniority and other related benefits in terms of ACP etc.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner(s) state that at this stage they would be satisfied if the case of the petitioner(s) is considered and decided in the light of the judgment passed by a Division Bench of this Court in LPA No.589 of 2015.

Learned State counsel states that he is not averse to the suggestion put forth by the learned counsel for the petitioner(s).

In view of the above, without advert to the merits of the case, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2- Principal Secretary-cum-Director General School Education, Punjab Civil Secretariat, Chandigarh to consider and decide the case of the petitioner(s) in the light of the judgment passed by a Division Bench of this Court in LPA No.589 of 2015 within four months from the receipt of the certified copy of the judgment. In case, on consideration, the Competent Authority reaches to the conclusion that the benefit claimed by petitioners is admissible to them, the same be released within a period of six weeks thereafter. However, in case the competent authority after consideration feels that the prayer made by the petitioners is not admissible to them, in that case, a speaking order be passed in the matter.

13.05.2019*ps-I***(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes No

Whether Reportable : Yes No