

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

CWP No.16398 of 2022 (O&M)

Date of Decision : 02.02.2023

Malkit Singh and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

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

PANKAJ JAIN, J.

All the petitioners retired as Chief Inspectors from respondent No.2. They claim revised pay scales in terms of Notification dated 21st of December, 2011 vide which the Station Supervisors were granted grade pay of Rs.3800/- w.e.f. 1st of January, 2006 and Rs.4200/- w.e.f. 1st of December, 2011 claiming that the posts of Station Supervisors and Chief Inspectors were placed in same pay-scales vide order dated 24th of May, 1991 placed on record as Annexure P-2 and the petitioners further claim re-fixation of their pay and pension accordingly.

2. The claim of the petitioners stands rejected vide order dated 28th of January, 2022 impugned in the present writ petition. The primary reason given in the order dated 28th of January, 2022 (Annexure P-8) is that the office order dated 24th of May, 1991

whereby the posts of Station Supervisor Grade-I and that of Chief Inspectors were ordered to be placed in the same pay-scales and were ordered to be treated at par is not applicable to the respondent-Corporation. The order dated 24th of May, 1991 (Annexure P-2) was issued for employees working in Punjab Roadways and not in the respondent-Corporation. It has been claimed that the employees of Punjab Roadways and that of respondent-Corporation are governed by separate Rules and Regulations. The hierarchal composition of the posts in two establishments is also different. The comparative chart as mentioned in the order dated 28th of January, 2022 reads as under :

Punjab Roadways	PRTC
Conductor	Conductor
Sub Inspector	Sub Inspector
Inspector	Inspector
Station Supervisor	Chief Inspector
Traffic Manager	Station Supervisor
	Traffic Manager

3. On the basis of the aforesaid chart, it has been thus claimed that as per the hierarchy as contemplated under the Rules applicable to the respondent-Corporation post of Chief Inspector is a step lower than that of Station Supervisor whereas in the promotional channel as applicable to the employees of Punjab Roadways the promotional post from the post of Inspector is Station Supervisor. The post of Chief Inspector does not exist in the hierarchal ladder as applicable to the

Punjab Roadways. The post of Chief Inspector being a feeder cadre post for that of Station Supervisor, the two posts were never clubbed and rather could never had been clubbed *qua* the employees of PRTC. Thus, the authorities concluded that the parity claimed in the present writ petition by the petitioners who retired as Chief Inspectors claiming revised pay scales admissible to the post of Station Supervisor is misplaced.

4. Counsel appearing for the petitioners is not in position to dispute the aforesaid fact. He has not been able to point out as to how order dated 24th of May, 1991 is applicable to the Corporation. He has also not pointed out any infirmity in the order impugned in the present writ petition. It is not disputed by him that the post of Chief Inspector as per the Rules applicable to the respondent-Corporation is a feeder cadre to the promotional post of Station Supervisor.

5. In view of these facts this Court does not find that the two cadres can be held to be at par to claim equal pay scale.

6. Resultantly, the present writ petition is ordered to be dismissed.

February 02, 2023
Dpr

(PANKAJ JAIN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No