



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

(232)

CWP No. 12737 of 2021
Date of Decision : 16.05.2024

Ram Avtar

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. Robin Lohan, Advocate for
Mr. Jai Bhagwan, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Harish Rathee, Sr. Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

Harsimran Singh Sethi J. (Oral)

In the present petition, the grievance being raised by the petitioner is that despite the fact that the services of the petitioner have been regularized w.e.f. 01.10.2003 and his pay has already been fixed in a regular pay scale from the said date but the arrears, which have been extended to him, are not correct as, similarly situated employee, namely, Raj daughter of Badlu Ram has been paid more amount as compared to the petitioner.

In the reply filed, the respondents have attached the calculation sheet for consideration of this Court to show that the amount for which the petitioner became entitled for, has rightly been calculated and extended to him and as far as the calculation sheet of Raj daughter of Badlu Ram, she has worked for more days as compared to the petitioner,



due to which, said 'Raj' daughter of Badlu Ram was paid more amount than the petitioner, hence, petitioner cannot raise any grievance on the said aspect.

There is no replication to the said statement.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record with their able assistance.

Once, the respondents have placed on record the calculation sheet, according to which, the amount already paid to the petitioner upon retrospective regularization is in accordance with law and number of days the petitioner had worked, no grievance can be raised by the petitioner. With regard to the paying of more amount to Raj daughter of Badlu Ram, it has already come on record that she has worked for more period as compared to the petitioner, due to which, her back wages have been calculated more as compared to the petitioner.

Once, the justification has been given for paying more amount to Raj daughter of Badlu Ram, the petitioner having not worked equal number of days as performed by Raj daughter of Badlu Ram, the petitioner cannot claim that he has been discriminated.

No ground is made out for any interference by this Court in the present petition.

Dismissed.

May 16, 2024
kanchan

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No