

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

221

LPA No.1727 of 2015 (O&M)

The Managing Committee Baba Banda Singh Bahadur Education Trust

.....Appellant (s)

Versus

Urmeet Chaudhary and another

.....Respondent(s)

(2)

LPA No.1728 of 2015 (O&M)

The Managing Committee Baba Banda Singh Bahadur Education Trust

.....Appellant (s)

Versus

Rajinder Singh and others

.....Respondent(s)

Decided on : 21.11.2022

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE G.S. SANDHAWALIA
HON'BLE MS.JUSTICE HARPREET KAUR JEEWAN**

Present: Mr. Manpreet Singh Longia, Advocate for the appellant.

Mr. Manu K. Bhandari, Advocate for the respondents.

G.S. Sandhawalia, J. (Oral)

Present appeals are directed against the order of the learned Single Judge wherein three writ petitions i.e. CWP Nos.8178, 8179 and 8180 of 2010 were allowed on 20.04.2015 and resultantly the order of the Educational Tribunal, Punjab dated 10.03.2010 was upheld and costs of Rs.10,000/- each were imposed. The Tribunal had granted the benefit of the revision of the pay-scales to the applicants, respondents herein, who were not in service as on 24.11.2011, though the benefit of revision of scales was to be granted from 01.01.1996, on which account they had approached the Tribunal.

It is to be noticed that Letters Patent Appeal No.1335 of 2015 titled as **Managing Committee, Baba Banda Singh Bahadur Education Trust Vs. D.S. Bedi and others** had also been preferred and tagged alongwith the present bunch. The appellant herein had settled the matter with the legal heirs of the said employee and accordingly, vide order dated 08.04.2019 the appeal was rendered infructuous and disposed of.

The matter has been kept pending on the request of the counsel for the appellant that there are possibility of amicable settlement between the parties which would be clear from the orders dated 08.04.2019 and 12.09.2022.

Today, Mr. Longia submits that he has no instructions and the appellants are not in touch with him.

Keeping in view the above, we dismiss the present appeals for want of prosecution. Even otherwise there is no justifiable grounds as such for the appellant to implement the orders of similarly situated employees in one case and deny the benefits to another set of employees, who are identically placed.

Dismissed for want of prosecution.

(G.S. SANDHAWALIA)
JUDGE

(HARPREET KAUR JEEWAN)
JUDGE

21.11.2022

Naveen

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No