

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

(102)

CWP No. 7018 of 2020

Date of Decision : 15.11.2022

Urmila Kumari

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. Sandeep Kumar Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Harsimran Singh Sethi J. (Oral)

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that keeping in view the statement of learned State counsel that the parity which is being claimed by the petitioner with one Amarjeet Kaur, is already under consideration with the department as the show cause notice has only been given to Amarjeet Kaur so as to re-fix her basic pay, hence the claim of the petitioner for the grant of basic pay as admissible to her junior Amarjeet Kaur, cannot be accepted, is incorrect.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that as per his instructions, Amarjeet Kaur was rightly granted the pay hence, the present petition may kindly be disposed of having been not pressed with liberty to the petitioner that in case the pay being granted to Amarjeet Kaur as of now is upheld, the petitioner will approach appropriate forum for the redressal of his grievance at the relevant time.

Ordered accordingly.

November 15, 2022

kanchan

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : No