

2023:PHHC:119484
IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-3382-2006
DECIDED ON: 12.09.2023

RAM NATH & ORS.

.....PETITIONERS

VERSUS

HUDA & ORS.

.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Surjit, Advocate for
Mr. Vikram Singh, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Deepak Balyan, Advocate for respondents.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

1. The petitioners have approached this Court vide instant writ petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for quashing the impugned letter dated 15.03.2004 (Annexure P-4) vide which the pay scale of 950-1400/-, which was granted to the petitioners w.e.f. 03.08.1993 was withdrawn and the same was alleged to be illegal and arbitrary act on behalf of the respondents-HSVP.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners has stressed on the fact that since there is a revision of pay scale and also the fact that other similarly situated employees vide various other writ petitions were granted the said benefit. Though, no written statement was filed on behalf of respondents.

3. Today, Mr. Balyan appearing on behalf of respondents-HSVP submits that the petitioners No.1 & 2 have retired and since they were non-technical employees were not entitled to the revision of said pay scale. As far as the claim of petitioners No.3, 4 & 5 is concerned, they are still in service, wherein petitioners No.3 & 4 are posted at Panipat and petitioner No.5 is posted at Ambala. He further

dated 30.03.2023 & 29.06.2020 respectively. As far as the claim of revision of pay scale of petitioners No.3 to 5 is concerned, they are working to the post of non-technical-IV and have been rightly rejected the revision of pay scale to which they are not legally entitled too.

4. In the light of above, learned counsel for the petitioner though seeks time to verify the fact with regard to the communication supplied by the respondents' counsel today in Court, but there is no occasion for this Court to grant an opportunity for the said purpose, as no reason is available with this Court to disbelieve the assertions made by the counsel for the respondents.

5. Hence, the grievance raised by the petitioners stands settled and satisfied.

6. In the light of above, this petition does not survive any further and has been rendered infructuous.

7. Ordered accordingly.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

12.09.2023

Meenu

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