



CWP-8739-2025

-1-

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

114

CWP-8739-2025

Date of decision : 16.07.2025

Union of India and others

... Petitioners

Versus

Daya Chand and another

... Respondents

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA**

Present:- Mr. Narender K. Vashist, Senior Panel Counsel
for the petitioners/UOI (through video conferencing).

Anupinder Singh Grewal, J. (Oral)

The petitioners have challenged the order dated 09.08.2024 (Annexure P-1) passed by the Central Administrative Tribunal, Chandigarh Bench (for short, 'the Tribunal') whereby OA No.060/01469/2018 preferred by respondent No.1 has been allowed and he has been granted the benefit of Grade Pay of Rs.2,800/-.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the Tribunal has erroneously relied upon the decision dated 17.04.2023 passed by the Principal Bench of the Tribunal in the case of **Satish Kumar and others versus Union of India and others (OA No.491/2016)** although it was not applicable to the case of respondent No.1 as he was beyond 50% of the cadre strength for whom grade pay of Rs.2,800/- was permissible.

3. We have heard learned counsel for the petitioners at some length.

**CWP-8739-2025****-2-**

4. The factual matrix of the case is that respondent No.1 had preferred the aforesaid OA claiming Highly Skilled Workers Grade-1 of Rs.2,800/- w.e.f. 01.12.1996, which is applicable to highly skilled workers in terms of the notification dated 28.07.2009 issued by the Ministry of Finance. Respondent No.1 was initially appointed as Attendant Mechanic (LP) on 24.08.1982 in the pay scale of Rs.210-290 as per the Pay scale of 3rd CPC, which was designated as Group 'D' post. He was promoted to the post of Machine Assistant (L.P.) on 07.04.1988 in the pay scale of Rs.950-1400, which is a Group 'C' post. He was further promoted to the post of Machine Man (LP) on 18.11.1999 in the pay scale of Rs.4000-6000 but later, due to modernization of Printing Press, the category of Machine Man was declared surplus. Therefore, he was re-deployed to the post of Offset Plate Maker on 15.02.2008 in the grade pay of Rs.2400/- to Rs.2800/- which subsequently had been withdrawn on 26.06.2014. Thereafter, he made a representation dated 21.04.2017 claiming Grade Pay of Rs.2,800/- w.e.f. 15.02.2008 in view of the instructions vide O.M. No.45014/1/2015-A.I dated 06/10.04.2017, whereby some employees of Govt. of India Press, Faridabad, who were holding the post of Highly Skilled Workers Grade-I w.e.f. 01.01.2006 onwards in the category of Offset Machine Assistant and Mechanic (Ptg. & Bdg.) were granted the Grade Pay of Rs.2,800/-.

5. There is no dispute that both these posts of Machine Man and Offset Plate Maker have been classified as Highly Skilled Workers Grade-1 as per the Rules which are applicable.

6. We do not accept the contention of the counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner did not fall within 50% cadre strength for whom the aforenoted Grade Pay would be applicable for the reason that the petitioners



CWP-8739-2025

-3-

had indeed been working on Highly Skilled Workers Grade-1 post and he was entitled to the pay scale as it has been set out in the notification that the Highly Skilled Workers Grade-1 would be entitled to grade pay of Rs.2,800/-.

7. The Tribunal has relied upon the judgment of the Principal Bench of the Tribunal in the case of **Satish Kumar and others versus Union of India and others (supra)** whereby similarly situated persons as respondent No.1 had been granted benefit of grade pay of Rs.2,800/- in terms of the notification dated 28.07.2009.

8. In response to a query of this Court as to whether the judgment in the case of **Satish Kumar and others versus Union of India and others (supra)** was challenged before this Court, learned counsel for the petitioner has very fairly submitted that this judgment was challenged before the Delhi High Court by preferring WP (Civil) No.1372/2024, but the writ petition preferred by the Union of India has been dismissed on 01.05.2025 and the relevant extract thereof is reproduced hereunder:-

“2. The learned counsel for the petitioner, placing reliance on the Office Memorandum dated 07.02.2012, submits that it had been decided by the Directorate of Printing, Ministry of Urban Development, that the cadres of Highly Skilled Workers under the Government of India Presses/ Government of India Textbook Presses/Branch Offices would be split in the ratio of 50:50 in Highly Skilled Workers Grade-II with the Grade Pay of Rs.2400/- (Pay Band PB-I) and Highly Skilled Workers Grade-I with the Grade Pay of Rs.2800/- (Pay Band PB-I). The split shall be based on inter-se-seniority of Highly Skilled Workers except Cameramen, and the inter-se-seniority list shall be maintained press-wise by the Manager/Branch Officer of the GIP concerned. She submits that, therefore, the Grade Pay of Rs.2800/- was to be granted strictly on the basis of the seniority.



CWP-8739-2025

-4-

3. *We are unable to accept the above submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner.*
4. *The Impugned Order records that the respondents are working as Machine Man Grade-I and Offset Plate Maker Grade-I, which as per the Recruitment Rules, is classified as Highly Skilled Workers Grade-I. This is not disputed by the learned counsel for the petitioner. As per the O.M. dated 07.02.2012 as well, the Highly Skilled Grade-I Workers were to be granted the Grade Pay of Rs.2800/-.*
5. *In our view, therefore, the learned Tribunal has rightly granted the said Grade Pay to the respondents. No infirmity can be found in the Impugned Order. "*

9. Consequently, we do not find any merit in this petition which stands dismissed.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

July 16, 2025
sonia gugnani

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