

[125] IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-25308-2021

Date of Decision :14.12.2021

Narinder Singh and Ors.

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and Ors.

....Respondents

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice B.S. Walia

Present : Mr. Nitesh Singla, Advocate for the petitioners.

B.S. Walia, J. (VC)

[1] Case is being taken up for hearing through Video Conferencing due to Covid-19 pandemic.

[2] Prayer in the petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is for the issuance of a writ, order or direction especially in the nature of Mandamus directing the official respondents i.e. respondent Nos.1 to 6 to step up the pay of the petitioners at par with their junior i.e. respondent No.7 in view of letter, Annexure P/7 dated 22.08.2019 as also speaking order, Annexure P/10 dated 17.09.2020 passed by the department in pursuance of order Annexure P-9 dated 19.06.2020 in CWP No.8290 of 2020 in case titled as "Sukhwinder Singh and others vs. State of Punjab and others" whereby other similarly situated persons as the petitioners have already been granted the aforesaid benefit. Prayer is also for issuance of directions to the respondents/Department to consider and decide representation/legal notice, Annexure P/8 dated 22.09.2021.

[3] At the outset, learned counsel contends that the petitioners have served legal notice, Annexure P/8 dated 22.09.2021 on the respondents in

respect of the grievances, which are the subject matter of the writ petition, but no decision has been taken on the same till date and that in the circumstances, the petitioners would be satisfied if the writ petition is disposed of by directing respondent No. 2 to consider and decide the claim made in legal notice, Annexure P/8 dated 22.09.2021, in accordance with law in a time bound manner.

[4] Notice of motion to respondent No.2 only.

[5] Mr. Vikas Mohan Gupta, Addl. A.G., Punjab accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.2 and on perusal of the writ petition states that he has no objection to the limited prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioners.

[6] I have considered the submissions of learned counsel for the parties, gone over the paper-book and in view of the nature of order proposed to be passed, there is no necessity to seek reply in the matter. Accordingly, in the light of the position noted above and in view of the statement of learned counsel for the parties but without commenting upon the merits of the case, the writ petition is *disposed of* by directing respondent No. 2 to consider and decide the claim made in legal notice, Annexure P/8 dated 22.09.2021, in accordance with law after taking into account all aspects of the matter within 04 months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

(B.S. Walia)
Judge

14.12.2021

'Amit'

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	:	<i>Yes/No.</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	:	<i>Yes/No.</i>