



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

(Sr. No. 105)

**RA-LP No. 68 of 2024 in
LPA No. 632 of 2024**

Date of decision: 13.09.2024

State of Haryana and another

..... Appellants

Versus

Suchitra and others

..... Respondents

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA**

Present : Mr. Harmanjot Singh Gill, Advocate
for the applicants-respondents No.11 & 12.

Mr. Sanjeev Kaushik, Addl. A. G., Haryana
for the non-applicants/appellants.

Mr. Kanwal Goyal, Advocate and
Ms. Sheena Dahiya, Advocate for
non-applicants/respondents No.1, 4, 5 & 10.

* * *

DEEPAK SIBAL, J. (Oral)

(1) The applicants were arrayed as respondents No.3 & 4 in the writ petition preferred by respondents No.1 to 10. Through judgment dated 29.09.2023, the said writ petition was allowed by a learned Single Judge of this Court. Resultantly, respondents No.1 to 10 herein were held entitled to the minimum of the pay scales (including dearness allowance) for the reason that the said respondents were not only as qualified as their regular counterparts but were also discharging identical duties. The State of Haryana's intra court appeal filed to challenge therein the aforesaid judgment by the learned Single Judge was dismissed on 04.03.2024.



(2) The applicants did not challenge the judgment of the learned Single Judge dated 29.09.2023. However, they have preferred the present application seeking review of the dismissal of the State's intra court appeal.

(3) Having not challenged the judgment of the learned Single Judge dated 29.09.2023 the present application on the applicants' behalf to seek review of the dismissal of the intra court appeal preferred by the State would be not maintainable. Even otherwise, the only ground on which review of our judgment dated 04.03.2024 is sought is another judgment of a Coordinate Bench dated 30.04.2024 passed in ***LPA No.733 of 2024 – State of Haryana and others Vs. Kalyan Singh and others***, which being a judgment of a subsequent date, would not make our judgment of an earlier date open to review.

(4) Still further, in the judgment dated 04.03.2024, the review of which is sought through the instant application, no error apparent on the record has been pointed out. Therefore, its review is not warranted.

(5) Dismissed.

(DEEPAK SIBAL)
JUDGE

13.09.2024
sunil yadav

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes / No

Whether reportable : Yes / No