

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

Rachhpal Singh and others ...Petitioners

State of Punjab and another ... Respondents

Present Mr. Anil Malhotra, Advocate for the petitioners.
Mr. D.K. Single, Addl. AG, Punjab.

SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA, J.(Oral)

“In contradistinction of above, in the present case, where the Cadre of Patwari is same, method of selection is same and the post is same, merely because a person in the seniority list of Patwaris above, it would be a fortuitous circumstance as to who may fall within the first 50% of the seniority list of Patwaris. As and when a person may retire, the next would claim higher grade. Seniority being a volatile incident of service as a person may go up in the seniority on account of senior persons being promoted or retired or having expired. The pay of such individual Patwari cannot be allowed to be changed on such circumstances and a stability is required to be maintained for grant of the pay scale to all persons in the Cadre.”

2. The aforesaid judgment having attained finality shall apply *mutatis mutandis* to the petitioners in this writ petition, who are similarly situated.
3. Accordingly, the writ petition is allowed. Steps shall be taken to comply with the order within a period of two months henceforth.
4. All pending misc. application(s) also stand disposed of.

(SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA)

JUDGE

09.11.2023.

rajesh

1. Whether speaking/reasoned? : Yes/No
2. Whether reportable? : Yes/No