

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-12883-2024
DATE OF DECISION: 28.05.2024

Roshani Devi and othersPetitioners

VERSUS

State of Haryana and anotherRespondents

CORAM HON’BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present Mr.Sukhdev Raj Kamboj, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr.Harish Nain, Asstt.AG, Haryana.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J (ORAL)

1. In the present petition, the grievance being raised by the petitioners is that petitioners though adjusted as Supervisors but are not being paid the same pay scale as being paid to the other similarly situated Supervisors, which act on the part of the respondents is arbitrary and illegal.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the question raised in the present petition has already been decided by this Court while passing order in CWP No.18041 of 2020 titled as **Sudesh Malik v. The State of Haryana and another**, decided on 01.04.2024 and keeping in view the settled principle of law, the petitioners are also entitled for the benefits as extended to the petitioners in **Sudesh Malik’s case (supra)**.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that the grievance raised in the present petition has already been raised by the petitioners in the representation dated 29.10.2018 (Annexure P-6) which is still pending consideration with the respondents and the petitioners will be satisfied

at this stage in case a time bound direction is issued to the respondents to decide the said representation by passing an appropriate speaking order.

4. Notice of motion.
5. Mr. Harish Nain, learned Assistant Advocate General, Haryana, who is present in the Court, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.
6. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that in case, the representation dated 29.10.2018 (Annexure P-6) has been received in the office of concerned authorities and is still pending consideration, the same will be decided by the authorities concerned within a period of eight weeks of the receipt of copy of this order and in case, after the decision of the representation, any benefit accrues to the petitioners, the same will also be released to them otherwise due reasons will be mentioned in the speaking order for not accepting the claim of the petitioners for their information and necessary action.
7. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that keeping in view the statement of learned counsel for the respondents, the present writ petition may kindly be disposed of having been not pressed any further.
8. Ordered accordingly.

28.05.2024
mamta

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

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