

Sr. No.725

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-6535-2001 (O&M)
Date of decision: 25.05.2022

Bachna Ram and others

...Petitioners

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

Present: None for the petitioners.

Mr. R.D.Sharma, DAG, Haryana.

ARUN MONGA, J. (ORAL)

Petition herein, inter alia, is for issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing circular dated 06.10.1981 issued by the Commissioner and Secretary to Govt. of Haryana Finance Department under Rule 6 of the Haryana Civil Services (Revised scales of pay) Rules, whereby pay-scale of Lascars were revised from Rs.300-430 to 350-500 w.e.f. 01.04.1979 instead of Rs.400-600 and also to quash action of the respondents in granting lower pay-scale of Rs.350-500 w.e.f. 01.04.1979 and pay scale of Rs.775-1025 w.e.f. 01.01.1986 and the pay-scale of Rs.2610-3540 w.e.f. 01.01.1996. Further a writ in the nature of Mandamus has been sought directing the respondents to grant the pay-scale of Rs.400-600 w.e.f. 01.04.1979, pay scale of Rs.950-1400 w.e.f. 01.01.1986 and pay-scale of Rs.3050-4590 w.e.f. 01.01.1996 which are the minimum pay-scales of Class-III services, and further directing the respondents to grant the petitioners, who are Lascars in N.C.C. on a Class C posts, the pay-scale of Class-C (Class-III) post.

2. Petition was admitted for hearing on 31.10.2001.

3. When taken up for final adjudication, there is no representation on behalf of the petitioners. It seems that by sheer effluxion of time and pendency of the writ petition for more than 20 years before this Court, either it has been rendered infructuous or even otherwise the petitioners seem to have lost interest in pursuing the same.

4. In any case, from perusal of record/pleadings, it appears that even on merits, claim of the petitioners is not admissible. Reference may be had in particular to the stand taken in para-1 of the preliminary submissions of the written statement filed by respondents No.1 to 4.

5. Learned State counsel has canvassed arguments on similar lines as the stand taken in the written statement.

6. I am in agreement with the stand taken by the respondents. Neither any replication has been filed to the afore-noted stand of the respondents nor any additional affidavit of any kind to controvert the same.

7. In view of the aforesaid, no grounds are made out to interfere.

8. Dismissed.

25.05.2022
mamta/mahavir

(ARUN MONGA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No