

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

210

CWP-9036-2017 (O&M)
Date of decision: 25.04.2024

Surjit Singh and Others
.....Petitioners
Versus
State of Punjab and Others
...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. R.K. Arora, Advocate for the petitioners
Mr. Manipal Singh Atwal, DAG Punjab

AMAN CHAUDHARY. J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed for quashing the impugned memo dated 10.03.2017, whereby the claim of the petitioners for grant of enhance grade pay has been declined.
2. Learned State counsel refers to para 3 of the affidavit dated 13.09.2023 filed by Deputy Director, Horticulture, SAS Nagar, wherein it has been stated as under:

“It is mentioned here that on the basis of recommendations of 6th pay commission, the Punjab Civil Services (Revised Pay) Rules, 2021 was issued by the Government of Punjab, Department of Finance for revision of pay scales of Punjab Government employees w.e.f. 1-1-2016 vide Notification dated 5-7-2021. As per above Rules the pay of the Horticulture Sub Inspector (petitioners) and Agriculture Sub Inspector has been fixed at the same level-6 on dated 1-1-2016, but the pay scale of the post of Horticulture Sub Inspector is less than as compared to the post of Agriculture Sub Inspector w.e.f. 1-12-2011. In these circumstances a proposal for revised the unrevised pay scale of the post of Horticulture Sub Inspector from 5910- 20200+2400 Grade Pay to 5910-20200+2800 Grade Pay at par with the post of Agriculture Sub Inspector w.e.f. 1-12-2011 was sent to the Department of Finance for advice by the Administrative Department vide letter dated 27-06- 2023. As above the matter is under consideration with the Department of Finance. After

receiving the advice of the Finance Department, the claim of the petitioners will be considered accordingly.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the matter has been pending for quite a while and as such, it needs to be finalised for which, a time bound direction be given to decide the same by granting them an opportunity of hearing.

4. Learned State counsel has no objection to the limited prayer made.

5. In view of the above and without commenting on the merits of the case, this petition is hereby disposed of with a direction to the respondents to consider and decide the claim of the petitioners, keeping in view the aforesaid, within a period of 6 months, which this Court has no reason to believe the authorities would not address in a just, fair and reasonable manner. Upon doing so, after notice and hearing offered to them and if found entitled, grant the benefit forthwith. Needless to say, if the orders are adverse to their interest, the same shall contain reasons and the petitioners shall be free to seek legal redress thereupon.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

25.04.2024
M.Kamra

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