

HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

108 - CWP No.17530 of 2020

Date of Decision: 26.10.2020

Kawaljit Kaur

... Petitioner

VS.

State of Punjab & Ors.

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE GIRISH AGNIHOTRI

Present: Mr. JS Jaidka, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. Nikhil Chopra, Addl. AG Punjab

GIRISH AGNIHOTRI, J. (Oral)

(1) The matter has been taken up through video-conferencing on account of lockdown due to outbreak of pandemic COVID-19.

(2) Notice of motion. Mr. Nikhil Chopra, Addl. AG Punjab accepts notice through video conferencing. In view of the nature of order which this Court proposes to pass, there is no necessity to call upon the respondents to file their reply, at this stage.

(3) The present writ petition has been filed by petitioner Kawaljit Kaur aged 58 years who retired from the Education Department as Head Teacher, *inter alia*, with a prayer seeking a direction to the respondent-authorities to grant her annual increment for completion of service rendered w.e.f. 01.01.2019 to 31.12.2019 along with arrears with 18% interest.

(4) Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that similar claim was raised in **CWP-2276-2020 (Hardeep Singh vs. State of Punjab & Ors.)** which was disposed of vide order dated 29.01.2020 directing the respondent-authorities to take a decision on the representation. Counsel urges that in pursuance thereto, the said Hardeep Singh had been granted the benefit as claimed. Petition thus seeks parity.

(5) Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that for the aforementioned grievance/demand, the petitioner has got served a representation dated 16.05.2020 (P1) which has not been decided by the authorities till date.

(6) Having heard learned counsel for the parties and without commenting upon the merits of the case, this Court deems it appropriate to dispose of the writ petition by directing the competent authority to consider and decide the petitioner's claim as raised in her representation (P1) as early as possible and preferably within two month from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

(7) Needless to say that the respondents, while taking the final decision, would take into account the order passed in Hardeep's Singh case (cited supra) and the subsequent office order which has been passed granting the requisite benefit to him.

(8) So ordered.

26.10.2020
Vvishal

(Girish Agnihotri)
Judge

1. Whether speaking/reasoned?
2. Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No