

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

CWP No. 20293 of 2021

DATE OF DECISION : 05.10.2021

Meena Kumari and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

Present : Mr. Ravinder Malik (Ravi), Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. Saurabh Mohunta, DAG, Haryana.

(Presence marked through video conferencing).

ARUN MONGA, J.(ORAL)

Petitioners herein, inter-alia, seeks issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to grant the benefit of minimum pay scale to the petitioners at par with District Level Officers, stated to be similarly situated like them, though working in other departments of State of Haryana. Reliance is laid on Apex Court

judgment rendered in Civil Appeal No. 213 of 2013 titled as “State of Punjab and others v. Jagjit Singh and others”.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that qua their aforesaid grievance, petitioners submitted representation dated 01.07.2020 (Annexure P-12), the same has not been decided by the respondents till date. Hence, the instant petition.

3. Notice of motion.

4. On advance service, learned State counsel joins proceedings and accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State of Haryana and seeks time to file reply.

5. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that let a final decision be taken, by the competent authority on the pending representation dated 01.07.2020 (Annexure P-12).

6. 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.

7. 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 grievance of the petitioners as per representation dated 01.07.2020 (Annexure P-12) and also by keeping in view the contentions

SHALINI BHATIA
2021.10.06 10:48
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

raised in the present petition by treating the same as supplementary representation and take a decision, in accordance with law.

8. It is expected of the competent authority to go through the recommendation contained at Annexure P-14 before passing speaking order and in case the said recommendations are not accepted, give reasons thereof.

9. Disposed of accordingly.

OCTOBER 05, 2021

Shalini

(ARUN MONGA)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes/No

Whether reportable:

Yes/No