

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-1233-2020

Date of decision: - 17.01.2020

Kamaljit Randhawa

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present:- Mr. Deepak Arora, Advocate
for the petitioner.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J. (ORAL)

Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that the question of law raised in the present writ petition as to whether the service rendered in the pay scale of C&V teachers prior to 01.01.1986 is to be counted for the grant of proficiency step up or not, came up for consideration before this Court in CWP No.16095 of 2012 titled as '**Baldev Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and others**' and other connected cases, which were decided by this Court on 16.05.2016, wherein keeping in view the affidavit filed by the Department of Finance, a direction was issued to the State to grant the benefit of proficiency step up to the classical and vernacular teachers by counting their service prior to 01.01.1986.

Learned counsel for the petitioner further argues that the said order was implemented by the respondents and while implementing the

said order, DPI (Elementary Education) Punjab passed an order on 12.07.2017 holding that the service rendered by the classical and vernacular teachers prior to 01.01.1986 will be taken into account for the grant of proficiency step up. Counsel for the petitioner argues that the said judgment has already been implemented qua the petitioners therein, who had approached this Court but the benefit of the same is not being extended to the petitioner herein without any valid justification though he is similarly situated.

The prayer of the petitioner is for issuance of a direction to consider the claim of the petitioner for the grant of proficiency step up by considering the service which the petitioner has rendered prior to 01.01.1986.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that for the relief which has been claimed in the present writ petition, the petitioner has submitted the respondents with a representation 01.12.2019 (Annexure P-17) which is still pending consideration with the respondents and the petitioner will be satisfied, at this stage, in case a time bound direction is issued to the respondents to decide the said representation by passing an appropriate speaking order.

Without commenting upon the merits of the case or about the entitlement of the petitioner for the relief which has been claimed by him in the representation 01.12.2019 (Annexure P-17), the present writ petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondents to decide the representation 01.12.2019 (Annexure P-17), within a period of three months from the receipt of certified copy of this order.

In case, it is found that the petitioner is entitled for any monetary benefits after the decision of the representation, the same should also be paid to him within three months thereafter. In case, the petitioner is found entitled for the relief, the arrears will be restricted only from the date of the submitting of representation i.e. 01.12.2019.

January 17, 2020
naresh.k

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?	Yes
Whether reportable?	No