

224

RA No.237 of 2015 in CWP No.24153 of 2011
RA No.399 of 2015 in CWP No.24156 of 2011
RA No.400 of 2015 in CWP No.24155 of 2011
RA No.384 of 2015 in CWP No.24154 of 2011
RA No.388 of 2015 in CWP No.4921 of 2012
RA No.382 of 2015 in CWP No.24158 of 2011
RA No.379 of 2015 in CWP No.4997 of 2012
RA No.378 of 2015 in CWP No.4901 of 2012
RA No.381 of 2015 in CWP No.5005 of 2012
RA No.385 of 2015 in CWP No.4906 of 2012
RA No.380 of 2015 in CWP No.24157 of 2011
RA No.386 of 2015 in CWP No.4902 of 2012
RA No.387 of 2015 in CWP No.4927 of 2012
RA No.383 of 2015 in CWP No.4919 of 2012

Jaswinder Singh Vs. Presiding Officer & others

Present: Mr. R.K.Arora, Advocate, for the applicant/petitioner(s).
Ms. Anu Pal, DAG, Punjab.
Mr. Sanjeev Soni, Advocate, for respondent No.4.

I find no ground to interfere on the slim argument of the order approximating Peons with Pump Operators trying to make out a distinction between Class IV and Class III employees to claim higher amount of compensation. Orders are not to be read as statutes. Reasons in the judgments are by analogy growing from differing inputs and factors, which may be present in the mind to quantify compensation. In any case, quantification of compensation is more in the realm of rule of thumb. Compensation works on what the court thinks is just and fair in a given case. I would, therefore, not interfere in the review applications and would dismiss the same.

However, the Court was informed that the judgment has been complied with by the respondents.

A photocopy of this order be placed on all the connected files.

24.09.2019
Vimal

[RAJIV NARAIN RAINA]
JUDGE