

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

108

CWP No.9654 of 2020

Date of decision:13.7.2020

Jagdeep Singh Cheema and ors

.....Petitioners

Vs

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: *HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH*

Present: Mr.Vinod K.Kataria, Advocate
for the petitioners.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J.(Oral)

The case has been taken up for hearing through video-conferencing.

Petitioners have preferred this writ petition for the issuance of appropriate directions to the respondents to make the payment of complete revised salary for the period from 29.9.2016 to 17.7.2018 qua petitioners No.1 to 7 and from 22.12.2016 to 17.7.2018 qua petitioners No.8 and 9 along with interest @ 18% per annum.

Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that the the petitioners were appointed as Commissioners in Right to Service Commission, Punjab (RTS) in the year 2016. The said Commission was dissolved on 17.7.2018. Government of Punjab implemented the recommendations of 7th Central Pay

Commission w.e.f. 1.1.2016. Revised salaries were not paid to the petitioners. However, the same were paid to Sh.S.C.Aggarwal, IAS (Retd.), Ex.RTS Commissioner and Jagdish Lal, who were appointed along with the petitioners. The aforesaid Jagdish Lal even filed CWP No.3614 of 2019 and the same was decided by the High Court vide order dated 8.2.2019 with a direction to the competent authority to decide the legal notice of the writ petitioner. The non compliance of the order of the High Court was ultimately resulted into filing of COCP No.1175 of 2019 and granting of requisite relief to aforesaid Jagdish Lal. Petitioners seek parity with that of Jagdish Lal in the context of their claim and precisely for the said reason, petitioners have already filed a legal notice/representation to the respondent on 19.4.2020 (Annexure P-5).

Notice of motion.

On the asking of Court, Mr. T.P.S. Chawla, DAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the respondent.

In view of nature of order, which this Court proposes to pass there is no necessity of calling upon reply at this stage, as no order prejudicial to the interest of respondent is being passed. However respondent No.3 can be asked to have a fair look at the grievance of the petitioners for which legal notice/representation dated 19.4.2020 (AnnexureP-5) has already been moved by them.

In view of above, this petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.3 to decide the legal notice/representation dated 19.4.2020 (Annexure P-5) moved by the petitioners in the context of their claim within a period of one month from the receipt of certified copy of this order.

Nothing expressed hereinabove would be construed to be an expression of any opinion on merits of the case.

July 13 , 2020

anita

Whether reasoned/speaking

Whether reportable

Yes/No

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Yes/No