

CWP No. 10626 of 2015 and
CWP No. 20582 of 2016

-1-

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

CWP No. 10626 of 2015
Date of decision: 17.01.2020

(I)

Kuldeep Singh

.....Petitioner

V/s.

Punjab and Sind Bank and another

.....Respondents

CWP No. 20582 of 2016

(II)

Ajay Kumar and others

.....Petitioners

V/s.

Punjab and Sind Bank and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: - HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR

Present: - Mr. Arvind Kumar Rana, Advocate with
Mr. S.S. Rana, Advocate,
for the petitioner (in CWP No. 10626 of 2015).

Mr. J.S. Gill, Advocate,
for the petitioners (in CWP No. 20582 of 2016).

Mr. R. Kartikeya, Advocate,
for the respondents (in CWP No. 10626 of 2015)

Mr. R.N. Lohan, Advocate,
for the respondents (in CWP No. 20582 of 2016).

Sanjay Kumar, J. (Oral)

The petitioner in CWP No.10626 of 2015 is a daily wage Peon
in the service of the Punjab and Sind Bank while the petitioners in CWP
No. 20582 of 2016 are working as Peons on contractual basis in the service

of the very same bank. They all claim to have been in service since a long time.

The prayer of the sole petitioner in CWP No.10626 of 2015 was to direct the Bank to extend to him the benefit of regular pay scales plus allowances on par with regular Peons while the prayer of the petitioners in CWP No. 20582 of 2016 was to direct the Bank to pay them revised salary as per the bipartite settlement dated 25.05.2015.

While so, Mr. S.S. Rana, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner in CWP No.10626 of 2015, and Mr. J.S. Gill, learned counsel for the petitioners in CWP No. 20582 of 2016, would state that all the petitioners would be satisfied at this stage if they are granted benefit on par with that extended to the petitioners in CWP No.10195 of 2017, titled '*Deepak Verma and others V/s. Zonal Manager, Punjab and Sind Bank*'. A copy of the order dated 18.12.2019 passed in the aforesaid case is placed on record. Perusal thereof reflects that this Court took note of the fact that the petitioners in that case were rendering services which were perennial in nature but the Bank had neither regularized their services nor placed them on the pay scales admissible to Class IV employees. The writ petition was accordingly disposed of directing the Bank to pay the petitioners equivalent to the minimum of the pay scale which was payable to regular employees.

As it is now stated that the petitioners in these two cases would be satisfied if the very same relief is extended to them, on par with the petitioners in CWP No.10195 of 2017, these writ petitions are disposed of directing the respondent-Punjab and Sind Bank to extend to all the

petitioners the minimum of the pay scale applicable to regular Peons in its service. This relief shall be extended to the petitioners from the date of institution of these writ petitions. Further, keeping in mind the fact that the petitioners have been in the service of the Bank since decades but they are still being treated as temporary in nature, the Bank is directed to consider their individual cases for regularization in accordance with rules, without reference to age and qualification stipulations, as and when vacancies in the posts of Peon arise. This exercise shall be commenced and concluded expeditiously and preferably, within a period of six months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

No order as to costs.

(SANJAY KUMAR)
JUDGE

17.01.2020

rakesh

whether speaking/non speaking : Yes/no

whether reportable/non reportable : Yes/no