

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

(115)

CWP-882-2024

Date of decision: - 16.01.2024

Ranjit Singh and others

....petitioners

Versus**State of Punjab and others**

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present:- Mr. Baljeet Singh Sidhu, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. Ferry Sofat, Additional Advocate General, Punjab.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. Present writ petition has been filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to step up the pay of the petitioners at par with their junior/respondent No.4 by removing the anomaly between the pay of the senior and junior government employees according to the notification dated 22.08.2019 (Annexure P-4).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioners, the petitioners has given a legal notice dated 18.09.2023 (Annexure P-7) and at this stage, the petitioners would be satisfied in case competent authority of respondent No.1 considers the same in accordance with law, within a specified time frame and in case the pleas raised by the petitioners are found to be meritorious, then, grant the appropriate relief to the petitioners.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the respondents has submitted that competent authority of respondent No.1 would consider the said legal notice dated 18.09.2023 (Annexure P-7), filed by the petitioners, in accordance with law and the same would be done within a period of three months from the date of certified copy of this order.

4. Keeping in view the above-said facts and circumstances, the present petition is disposed of, with a direction to competent authority of respondent No.1 to consider the legal notice dated 18.09.2023 (Annexure P-7) filed by the petitioners within a period of three months from the date of receipt of the certified copy of this order and in case competent authority of respondent No.1 is of the view that the pleas raised by the petitioners are meritorious, then, the appropriate relief be granted to the petitioners as expeditiously as possible. In case, competent authority of respondent No.1 is of the view that the pleas raised by the petitioners are meritless, then, a speaking order rejecting the claim be passed within the aforesaid period of three months.

5. It is made clear that this Court has not opined on the merits of the case and competent authority of respondent No.1 would consider and decide the matter independently, in accordance with law.

January 16, 2024
naresh.k

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No