



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

203

COCP-2274-2016 (O&M)
Date of decision: 19.08.2025

Kulwant Kaur and another

...Petitioners

V/s

Vini Mahajan and others

...Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKRAM AGGARWAL

Present: None for the petitioners.

Ms. Shiny Chopra, AAG, Punjab.

VIKRAM AGGARWAL, J (ORAL)

On 14.09.2017, the following order was passed:-

“Learned State counsel submits that in LPA preferred by the Department, order passed by the writ Court has been stayed and next date of hearing is 09.11.2017.

To come up on 16.12.2017.”

2. Today, learned State counsel has produced a copy of judgment dated 11.01.2023 passed by a Division Bench in LPA-234-2017. Vide the said judgment, the letters patent appeal was partly allowed. It was held as under:-

“In our opinion, emphasis ought not to be made on the word "pattern" used in Annexure P3 notification dt. 12.03.1989 to decide whether the pay revision has been done as per the 'recommendations of the UGC or not, and one needs to look at the actual pay revision made and see whether it is on par or akin to those recommended by the UGC in Annexure P8 notification dt.12.01.1988. The word 'pattern' in the Annexure P3 notification dt. 12.03.1989 appears to have been loosely used to convey that it is 'on same lines' as per 'recommendations' of the UGC, and the learned Single Judge erred in not looking at the actual revision in scales of pay given to the Writ Petitioners in Annexure P3 notification dt.12.03.1989 while comparing it with Annexure P8 notification dt. 12.01.1988 issued by the State of Punjab revising scale of pay for teaching personnel of the University and its colleges.

Since there is an obvious parity in the revisions of pay scales as between Senior Lecturers. Assistant Professors and Associate Professors in Punjab State Medical/Dental Colleges with the teaching personnel holding the positions of Senior Lecturers and Reader in the University



Colleges mentioned in the Annexure P8 notification dt. 12.01.1988, we are of the view that such of the respondents/non-applicants, who are holding the positions of Senior Lecturers. Assistant Professors and Associate Professors in Punjab State Medical/Dental Colleges, would not be entitled to the benefit under Rule 8 of the 1988 Rules, but such of the respondents/non-applicants holding the posts of Professors in the Punjab State Medical/Dental Colleges would be entitled to the benefit of Rule 8 of the 1988 Rules since their pay revision is not on lines recommended by the UGC and is much less than what was recommended by the UGC.

Therefore, to the above extent, the judgment of the learned Single Judge is set aside and the appeal is partly allowed. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.”

3. Concededly, petitioner No.1 (Dr. Kulwant Kaur) was a Senior Lecturer, which is evidence from the memo of parties in CWP-2462-1995. Petitioner No.2 (Dr. Virinder Singh) was an Assistant Professor. As per the judgment of the Division Bench, Senior Lecturers, Assistant Professors and Associate Professors were not held to be entitled to the benefit as claimed and only those were held entitled, who were holding the posts of Professors.
4. That being so, the present contempt petition has been rendered infructuous and is disposed of as such.

Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(VIKRAM AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

August 19, 2025
vcgarg

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