

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

.....Respondent(s)

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that non-grant of the said benefit to the petitioners who are the similarly situated employees is causing prejudice to the petitioners and the same is discriminatory and is also contrary to the judgment of the Division Bench of this Court in CWP No. 4382 of 2002 titled as ***Satbir Singh Vs. State of Haryana***, decided on 21.03.2002.

Learned counsel for the respondent-State submits that as per the oral instructions submitted, the claim of the petitioners have not been allowed but appropriate speaking orders are yet to be passed and he seeks directions to do the needful.

The present petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondents to decide the claim of the petitioners as raised in the present petitioner. In case, the petitioners are found similarly as the petitioners in *Harmandeep Kaur's case (supra)*, the benefit extended to the petitioners in *Harmandeep Kaur's case (supra)* be also extended to the petitioners in the present writ petition and in case, it is found feasible to accept the claim of the petitioners, the same will be accepted, otherwise due reasons will be mentioned for not accepting the claim of the petitioners in the speaking order to be passed and the said order will be duly conveyed to the petitioners.

Let the needful be done within a period of 8 weeks from the receipt of copy of this order

Ordered accordingly.

Pending application, if any, also stands disposed of.

26-11-2024
Sapna Goyal

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

NOTE: Whether speaking: YES/NO
Whether reportable: YES/NO