

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

**CWP-2924-2021 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 10.02.2021**

Chanchal Singh and ors

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

Present : Mr. Maninder Arora, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Ms. Mamta Talwar, DAG, Haryana.
(Presence marked through video conference).

ARUN MONGA, J. (ORAL)

Petition herein is under Article 226 of Constitution of India seeking, *inter alia*, issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to release benefit of higher pay scale, seeking parity with other employees granted who have been accorded the same benefit.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that respondent No.3 has passed an order dated 17.12.2020 (Annexure P-9) whereby representation of the petitioners has been rejected.

3. In the premise, petitioners filed an application before respondent No.2 dated 28.12.2020 (Annexure P-10) wherein reminders were also sent but to no avail. Hence, the instant petition.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that he would be satisfied, at this stage, if a final decision is taken by respondent No.2 on the pending application dated 28.12.2020 (Annexure P-10).

5. Notice of motion.

6. Ms. Mamta Talwar, DAG, Haryana on service of advance copy of the petition joins the proceedings and accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State of Haryana.

7. Given the nature of order being passed, there is no necessity to seek return by any of the respondents as no further proceedings and/or pleadings are required.

8. Without commenting on the merits of the case, the writ petition is disposed of with a direction to the competent authority to look into the application dated 28.12.2020 (Annexure P-10) and also by keeping in view the contentions stated in the present petition by treating the same as supplementary representation and decide the same, by passing a speaking order, in accordance with law, keeping in mind the administrative orders contained at Annexure P-7, which the learned counsel for the petitioners contends has been passed to give benefit to the similarly situated employees. While on the other hand, petitioners have not been accorded the same benefit.

9. Disposed of accordingly.

February 10, 2021
vandana

(ARUN MONGA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether reportable: Yes/No