

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

204

CWP-3123-1997(O&M)
Date of Decision: 09.09.2024

SURAJ BHAN AND OTHERS

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present: Mr. B.K. Bagri, Advocate
for petitioners No.6 to 9, 20, 24, 25, 33 and 34.

None for remaining petitioners.

Mr. Krishan K. Chahal, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J. (Oral)

This petition has been filed, *inter alia*, seeking a writ of *mandamus* directing the respondents to place the petitioners in the pay scale of ₹525-1050 with effect from 01.04.1979, and ₹1400-2600 with effect from 01.01.1986, keeping in view their qualifications, nature of duties, responsibilities, etc.

2. Learned State counsel has referred to the written statement filed on behalf of the respondents, to contend that the petitioners' case was examined by a Committee of experts, which opined, since the petitioners were working as Junior Librarians they were not entitled to the pay scale of ₹1400-2600 meant for the post of Librarian. Both posts are different, with different pay scales and governed by separate Service Rules. Besides, qualifications prescribed for these posts are also different. The petitioners were appointed in the Department only as a stopgap in the absence of Senior Librarians, which did not entitle them to higher pay scale. Similar issue has already been

decided against the petitioners by this Court vide order dated 12.07.1994, in CWP No. 8991 of 1994 titled *Rachna Dewan and others v. State of Haryana and others*.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners is not in a position to dispute the facts aforementioned.
4. In view thereof, there is no merit in the petition and it stands dismissed.
5. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall also stand(s) disposed of as having been rendered infructuous.

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE

09.09.2024
Ad

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