



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

CWP-8012-2024

Reserved on : 09.12.2025

Pronounced on : 15.12.2025

Uploaded on : 16.12.2025

Baljit Singh and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAMIT KUMAR

Argued by : Mr. Baldev Singh Maan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Swapan Shorey, DAG, Punjab.

NAMIT KUMAR, J.

1. The petitioners have invoked the writ jurisdiction of this Court by filing the instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, seeking a writ of certiorari for quashing and setting aside the stipulation in the appointment letter dated 03.12.2020 (Annexure P-1), whereby the petitioners have been given a pay scale lower than the pay scale granted to the identically placed employees who were selected and appointed as Surveyors in the Department of Soil Conservation through the same recruitment process based on the same advertisement No.6/2015, issued by the Punjab Subordinate Services Selection Board, as the said stipulation is totally illegal, arbitrary and violative of Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India. Further, a writ of mandamus has been sought for directing the respondents to grant the same pay scale of Rs.5910-20200+2400 Grade

Pay [as further revised by Punjab Civil Services (Revised Pay) Rules, 2021], which has been granted to the identically placed employees who were appointed as Surveyors in the year 2016, through the same recruitment process, to the petitioners and to fix their pay notionally with effect from the year 2016, when the same has been granted to the other identically placed Surveyors, along with interest at the rate of 12% per annum. Further, a writ of mandamus has been sought for directing the respondents to fix the seniority of the petitioners as per composite merit list prepared by the Board.

2. The brief facts of the case as have been pleaded in the petition are that on the basis of requisitions received by Punjab Subordinate Selection Board (hereinafter referred to as 'Board') from various departments of Government of Punjab, the Board issued an advertisement No.6/2015 on 29.12.2015 (Annexure P-3) through its official website, inviting online applications from eligible candidates for filling up of various categories of posts including 347 posts of Surveyors in the Department of Soil and Water Conservation, Punjab. Out of the said 347 posts, 142 were meant for general category and 45 for ex-servicemen category. The scale of pay for the post of Surveyor as mentioned in the advertisement No.6/2015 (Annexure P-3) was Rs.5910-20200+2400 Grade Pay, based on Punjab Civil Services (Revised Pay) Rules, 2009 effective from 01.01.2006, as per the recommendations of the 5th Punjab Pay Commission. This pay scale was further revised vide Punjab Civil Services (Revised Pay) Rules, 2021, based on the recommendations of the 6th Punjab Pay Commission, effective from 01.01.2016. A comparative chart showing

the pre-revised and revised pay scale of the post of Surveyors is as under:-

Pre-revised pay scale based on Fifth Punjab Pay Commission w.e.f. 01.01.2006	Revised Pay scale based on Sixth Punjab Pay Commission w.e.f. 01.01.2016
5910-20200+2400 Grade Pay	Rs.25600 in Level 6 of Pay Matrix

3. The petitioners who all belong to ex-servicemen category, applied for the post of Surveyor and all the candidates were asked to appear in the counselling along with their original documents, held on 29.09.2016, 30.09.2016, 03.10.2016 and 04.10.2016. The petitioners, along with other candidates, appeared in the counselling on the scheduled dates for selection to the posts of Surveyors against the post reserved for ex-servicemen category and after considering the names of all the eligible candidates, the Board declared the result of the selected candidates for appointment to the posts of Surveyors vide Public Notice dated 28.12.2016 (Annexure P-5), published on the official website of the Board. However, in para 5 of the said Public Notice dated 28.12.2016, it was specifically mentioned that due to administrative reasons, the result of the candidates belonging to the category of ex-servicemen shall be declared lateron. On the basis of the result declared by the Board, vide Public Notice dated 28.12.2016, the recommendations of the names of the candidates for appointment to the post of Surveyor were sent by the Board to the respondent-department, vide letter dated 28.12.2016 (Annexure P-6) and in pursuance of the above recommendations of the Board, the respondent-department issued appointment letters to the selected candidates on the same day i.e. 28.12.2016, belonging to various categories, in the pay scale of

Rs.5910-20200+2400 Grade Pay as per Punjab Government instructions and they joined their service in January, 2017. However, the result of the candidates belonging to the category of ex-servicemen was not still declared due to administrative reasons and none of the candidates belonging to the category of ex-servicemen was given appointment as Surveyor. Subsequently, after a period of about four years, the names of the petitioners were also recommended by the Board vide letter dated 22.07.2020 (Annexure P-9) to the respondent-department for appointment to the posts of Surveyor against the vacancies reserved for the category of ex-servicemen as per the aforesaid Advertisement No.6/2015. Consequently, the petitioners were also given appointments as Surveyors on 03.12.2020 and after completing necessary formalities such as medical examination for entry into Government service and verification of their character and antecedents and further verification of their educational qualifications and other documents, the petitioners joined service in January, 2021 on the following dates:-

Sr. No.	Name of the Petitioner	Designation	Date of Joining	Division in which Posted
1.	Baljit Singh	Surveyor	25.01.2021	Divisional Soil Conservation Officer, SAS Nagar.
2.	Jaspal singh	Surveyor	12.01.2021	Divisional Soil Conservation Officer, Jalandhar
3.	Parkash Singh	Surveyor	11.01.2021	Divisional Soil Conservation Officer, Sangrur
4.	Jodha Singh	Surveyor	18.01.2021	Divisional Soil Conservation Officer, Muktsar

that although they have been selected and appointed to the posts of Surveyor in the respondent-department through the same recruitment process based on the same advertisement but they have been granted a pay scale lower than the pay scale granted to the identically placed employees belonging to other categories, who were also recruited and appointed as Surveyors through the same recruitment process against the same advertisement. Thus, by granting two different pay scales to the identically placed employees, who were appointed on the same posts through the same recruitment process, the department has *per se* acted in violation of Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India.

5. On issuance of notice of motion, separate written statements on behalf of respondents No.1 and 2 and respondent No.3 have been filed.

6. In the written statement filed by way of an affidavit of Ms.Amarbir Kaur Bhullar, Secretary, Subordinate Services Selection Board, Punjab, on behalf of respondent No.3, it has been stated as under:-

“xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx

5. That it is submitted that after the completion of recruitment process pertaining to this advertisement, and the recommendation of eligible candidates were recommended for appointment to the post of Surveyor to the respondent No 2 vide letter dated 28.12.2016 (P/6). Thereafter, CWP No. 5770 of 2017 titled as Surjit Singh and Ors Vs State of Punjab and Ors was filed for quashing the select list 28.12.2016 (P/5) prepared for the advertisement dated 29.12.2015 (P/3) as against the 347 posts of the surveyor, the respondent have selected a number of candidates who had not possess the requisite qualification as laid down in the rules. The Hon'ble High Court vide interim order dated 23.03.2017 stayed the further appointments to the post of Surveyor. Thereafter, the Hon'ble High Court passed the orders dated 05.04.2018 with the directions to the respondent No. 1 to 3 to recast the selection list within the two months from the

date of the orders and further directed no further appointment letter based on the previous selection list shall be issued till the exercises was completed. The copy of interim order dated 23.03.2017 is attached as Annexure R/1.

6. That, it is submitted that the answering respondent Board only completes the recruitment process as per the requisitions received and recommends the eligible candidates, who fall in the zone of consideration for recommendation to the concerned Department for appointment. That, it is submitted that in the meantime the affected/appointed candidates filed LPA No. 647 of 2018 in CWP No. 5770 of 2017 titled as Sawrajpreet Singh and Ors VS State of Punjab which was allowed on 30/05/2018 and the Civil Writ Petition was remitted to the Single Bench to decide the matter after hearing the arguments of the parties on dated 01/08/2018. The Hon'ble High Court Passed the orders dated 1.08.2018 to let the Secretary, Agriculture department undertake a fresh exercise by appointing a committee of experts to go into the eligibility of the candidates in the light of contentions raised in this petition to resolve the issue.

7. That, it is submitted that during the hearing of CWP No. 5770 of 2017 and other connected cases, the Ex-Servicemen candidates have filed CM-16301-CWP-2018 and CM-16302-CWP-2018 and claimed that they have not been appointed because of the Interim Orders dated 23.03.2017 passed by the Hon'ble High Court. The Hon'ble High Court passed the interim orders dated 13.01.2020 and directed that respondents shall proceed to consider and decision taken with regard to the declaration of the result of the candidates of Army Category. The relevant extracts of the order is as under:

"..... It may be added here that the claim of the candidates in CM-16301-CWP-2018 & CM-16302-CWP-2018, who belong to the Army category and have not been appointed because of the interim order dated 23.03.2017 passed by this Court, shall be proceeded to consider and decision be taken with regard to the declaration of the result of the candidates of the Army category....."

The copy of interim order dated 13.01.2020 is attached as Annexure R/2.

8. That it is submitted that in compliance of above interim orders passed by the Hon'ble High Court, the answering respondent Board has recommended to the Respondent No. 2, the candidates of different categories of Ex-Servicemen for appointment including the petitioners vide letter dated 22.07.2020 (P/9).

9. That is it submitted that the grievance regarding removing the stipulation in the appointment, granting and fixing of Pay Scale equal to the candidates appointed through the same recruitment process under Advertisement 06 of 2015 and fixation of Seniority and payment of arrears of Pay and Allowances to the petitioners are not under the domain of answering respondent Board. Therefore, no action is required to be taken at the level of answering respondent Board being proforma party.

xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx”

7. In the written statement filed by way of affidavit of Mr.Mohinder Singh, Chief Conservator of Soils, Punjab, on behalf of respondents No.1 and 2, it has been stated as under:-

“xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx

2. That it is submitted that employees appointed earlier who have been granted the pay scale of Rs.5910-20200+2400 (Grade Pay) (as further revised vide Punjab Civil Services (Revised Pay) Rules, 2021) have all been appointed before the notification dated 17.07.2020 (Annexure P-8) came into effect.

3. That it is further submitted that notification dated 17.07.2020 (Annexure P-8) was issued by Department of Finance in which it is stated that Government of Punjab decided that the Pay Scales admissible to all prospective recruitments/appointments in any cadre of any Administrative Department of the Government of Punjab or the entities there under shall not be higher than the Pay scales admissible to the said cadre in Government of India as notified as per the recommendations of the 7th Central Pay Commission. The Department of Finance notification letter No 7/87/2020-5-FP1/1145 dated 29-10-2020. The translated copy of the same is annexed as Annexure-R-2

4. That it is apposite to mention here that the names of the petitioners for appointment to the post of Surveyor were recommended by respondent No.3 (Punjab Subordinate Services Selection Board) vide letter dated 22.07.2020 (Annexure P-9) and appointment letters were issued to the petitioners thereafter. So, applying the notification dated 17-07-2020, the pay of the petitioners has been fixed accordingly (Annexure P-8).

5. That the issue w.r.t. fixation of pay of the petitioners was referred to the Department of Finance, Punjab for advice through Administrative Department and the

Department of Finance vide letter dated 05.11.2020 (Translated copy of letter is attached as Annexure R-1) advised that pay is to be fixed as per notification dated 17.07.2020 (Annexure P-8) and hence, on the advice of the Department of Finance the pay of the petitioners was accordingly fixed.

xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx”

8. Learned for the petitioners submitted that the action of the respondents in granting two different pay scales to similar set of employees, who have been recruited in pursuance to the same advertisement is totally illegal, arbitrary and not permissible in law. He further submitted that the instructions dated 17.07.2020 (Annexure P-8) issued by the Finance Department, which have been relied upon by the respondents in the written statement, runs contrary to the rules governing the service of the petitioners and is also contrary to the Punjab Civil Services (Revised Pay) Rules, 2009 effective from 01.01.2006, which have further been revised by Punjab Civil Services (Revised Pay) Rules, 2021. In support of his contention, reliance was placed upon a judgement of this Court in ***CWP No.15896 of 2023—Saurabh Sharma and others v. State of Punjab and another, decided on 13.09.2024***, wherein similar action of the respondents therein has been set aside and the petitioners therein have been held entitled for the pay scale as contemplated under the recruitment rules. The said judgement has been upheld by a Division Bench of this Court in ***LPA No.2977 of 2024—State of Punjab and another v. Dr. Saurabh Sharma and others, decided on 10.12.2024***.

9. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has submitted that the petitioners have been appointed as Surveyors, vide appointment letter dated 03.12.2020 and granted the pay scale in terms of the notification

dated 17.07.2020 issued by the Finance Department and, therefore, there is nothing wrong in granting the pay matrix to the petitioners in terms of the said notification. He further submitted that some delay has occurred in making the appointment of the petitioners as in ***CWP No.5770 of 2017 (Surjit Singh and others v. State of Punjab and others)***, selection of certain candidates was challenged by the general category candidates as they were not eligible, this Court, vide order dated 23.03.2017, passed the interim order whereby further appointments to the post of Surveyor were stayed.

10. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

11. In pursuance to advertisement No.6/2015 (Annexure P-3) issued by the Board, eligible candidates applied for the posts of Surveyor in different categories, including that of petitioners in ex-servicemen category and appeared in the counselling on the scheduled dates for selection to the posts of Surveyor. The Board declared the result of various categories, except ex-servicemen due to administrative reasons, and sent the names of the selected candidates to the respondent department, vide letter dated 28.12.2016 (Annexure P-6), who in turn issued appointment letters to the selected candidates on the same day, in the pay scale of Rs.5910-20200+2400 Grade Pay, who joined their service in January, 2017. Thereafter, after a period of about four years, the Board recommended the names of the petitioners, vide letter dated 22.07.2020 (Annexure P-9) to the respondent department for appointment to the posts of Surveyor against ex-servicemen category in pursuance of which they were also given appointments as Surveyors on

03.12.2020, and joined their service in January, 2021, but the petitioners have been given a pay scale lower than the pay scale granted to the identically placed employees, who were also recruited and appointed as Surveyors under the same recruitment process, in pursuance to the notification dated 17.07.2020 issued by the Finance Department.

12. Before proceeding further, it is relevant to give reference to the notification dated 17.07.2020, issued by the Finance Department, on the basis of which the petitioners have been granted the lower pay scale. The relevant portion from the said notification reads as under:-

“xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx

Subject: New Pay Scales for the fresh recruitment/appointment in the service of Government of Punjab or its entities thereof-regarding.

Sir/Madam,

These instructions are issued in continuation of the instructions issued by the Department of Finance in respect of the temporary posts; recruitment against vacant posts and revival of posts vide its letter No.5/41/2009-5FPPC/1297 dated 06.06.2019 and its subsequent clarification with regard to creation of posts and restructuring of the Administrative Department issued vide letter No.5/41/2009-5FPPC/287 dated 14.02.2020.

2. The Government of Punjab, after careful consideration, has now decided that the Pay scales admissible to all prospective recruitments/appointments- Direct recruitments/compassionate appointment in any cadre of any Administrative Department of the Government of Punjab or the entities there under shall not be higher than the Pay scale admissible to the said cadre in Government of India as notified as per the recommendations of the 7th Central Pay Commission.

3. The Administrative Departments shall, accordingly, with the prior concurrence of the Department of Finance, notify the pay scales for the prospective recruitment to the cadres under it and amend the relevant rules, wherever necessary.

4. *The Administrative Departments shall also ensure a*

similar exercise of notifying the applicable Pay Scales to new recruitment, in consultation with the Department of Finance, to the entities under their administrative control, ie, all the Public Sector Undertakings, Boards, Corporations, agencies including Cooperative institutions/ Panchayati Raj Institutions/ Urban Local Bodies etc. Similarly, the Administrative Department shall also ensure the amendment in relevant rules, wherever necessary.

5. It is clarified that wherever the recruitment/appointment process has been initiated, the same may be kept on hold till the Administrative Department or its entity, as the case may be, notifies its Pay scale for the fresh recruitment/appointment of the cadres as per the instructions contained in this letter and the process shall begin afresh with the issuance of necessary corrigendum, if required, in this behalf.

6. It is also clarified that the Administrative Department is the competent authority to issue the requisite notification of Pay Scales/amendment in rules, with the prior concurrence of Department of Finance, without taking the proposal to the Council of Ministers for its approval.

7. The instructions issued by the Finance Department vide notification No. 7/204/2012-4FP1/66 dated 15.1.2015 and letters issued in continuation thereof, regarding grant of basic pay (minimum of the pay band) and allowances during the probation period shall also be applicable to the fresh recruitments.

xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx”

13. There is no dispute that the services of the petitioners are governed by the rules known as Punjab Soil and Water Conservation and Waste Land Development Class-III Service (Non-Ministerial) Rules, 2001 (Annexure P-2). Pay scale as per the said Rules for the post of Surveyor is Rs.4020-6200, which has been revised vide Punjab Civil Services (Revised Pay) Rules, 2009 to Rs.5910-20200+2400 Grade Pay. The post of Surveyor was advertised vide advertisement No.6/2015 in the said pay scale. The candidates belonging to other categories, except ex-servicemen, were given appointment on 28.12.2016 (Annexure P-7) in the said pay scale, however, the recommendations with regard to ex-servicemen category were withheld

due to administrative reasons and they were given appointment on 03.12.2020 (Annexure P-1) after a period of four years and that too in lower pay scale. Similar issue came up for hearing before this Court in ***Sourabh Sharma's case (supra)***, wherein it has been held that the employees are entitled to the pay scale prescribed for the post under the applicable recruitment rules and the instructions dated 17.07.2020, which runs contrary to the recruitment rules, cannot be applied for the purpose of determining the pay scale. In the said judgment, it has been held as under:-

“xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx

8. *It is a settled principle of law that the appointment as well as the pay scale is to be given in accordance with the rules governing the service. Learned counsel for the respondents concedes the fact that as per 2016 Rules, which are applicable upon the petitioners qua the post of Assistant Professor, the pay scale envisaged therein is ₹ 37,400 – ₹67,000/- + ₹8600/- Grade Pay. That being the position, the petitioners should have been given the pay scale of the post of Assistant Professor as envisaged under the 2016 Rules.*

9. *Further, with regard to the argument of learned counsel for the respondents that when the posts were advertised, the Instructions of the State dated 17.07.2020 were already in operation, hence, the petitioners have been granted the benefit of pay only as per the Instructions dated 17.07.2020, it may be noticed that merely that the respondent-State had issued Instructions dated 17.07.2020, the same will not overwrite the 2016 Rules governing the service. It is a settled principle of law that in case, there is a conflict between the Instructions and the Rules governing the service, the 2016 Rules will prevail over the Instructions dated 17.07.2020, hence, once under the 2016 Rules which have supremacy over the Instructions dated 17.07.2020, the petitioners are held entitled for the pay scale of ₹37,400 – ₹67,000/- + ₹8600/- Grade Pay while working on the post of Assistant Professor as envisaged under 2016 Rules, they cannot be denied the said benefit of pay under 2016 Rules merely that contradictory Instructions dated 17.07.2020 have been issued by the State. Until and unless the 2016 Rules are amended to be in conformity with the Instructions dated 17.07.2020, the Instructions dated 17.07.2020*

cannot be given effect to till the said Instructions remain in conflict with the 2016 Rules governing the service.

10. At this stage, learned counsel for the respondents submits that the Instructions have only been issued to supplement the Rules. The State has a power to issue Instructions to supplement the Rules. The supplement Instructions will only operate in a field which is not covered by the 2016 Rules governing the service or on the aspect qua which 2016 Rules are silent.

11. In the present petitions, the pay scale of the post in question has been described in the 2016 Rules itself, hence, it cannot be said that by the Instructions dated 17.07.2020, respondents were supplementing the Rules. Rather the Instructions dated 17.07.2020 are contrary to the 2016 Rules qua the pay scale of the post on which petitioners are working and hence, said Instructions dated 17.07.2020 cannot be made operational till 2016 Rules are amended.

12. Even otherwise, in case the plea of the respondents is accepted that after 17.07.2020, the Instructions dated 17.07.2020 will operate then also the respondents have violated their own Instructions dated 17.07.2020 qua the promotions which have been made to the post of Assistant Professor. It is a conceded fact that the employees promoted to the post of Assistant Professor after the appointment of the petitioners in 2021, have been given the pay scale as envisaged under 2016 Rules, hence, the respondents cannot pick and choose as to when the 2016 Rules will be applicable or the Instructions dated 17.07.2020 will be applicable.

13. The scenario in the present cases is that all the appointees to the post of Assistant Professor prior to the appointment of the petitioners are enjoying the pay scale of the post as envisaged under 2016 Rules and even the promotees who have been promoted after the appointment of the petitioners, the Instructions dated 17.07.2020 have not been made applicable on them and their pay has been fixed according to the pay scale mentioned in 2016 Rules. This is clear case of pick and choose to apply 2016 Rules to some employees and Instructions to other employees, which cannot be permitted.

14. Hence, once the 2016 Rules governing the service which have a statutory force, are operational and prescribes a particular pay scale for the post being held by the petitioners and have not been amended so far, the same has to be made applicable by ignoring the Instructions dated 17.07.2020, which are contrary to 2016 Rules, hence the respondents are directed to grant the petitioners the pay scale as envisaged under 2016 Rules i.e. ₹37,400 – ₹67,000/- + ₹8600/- Grade Pay.

xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx”

14. The said judgment has been upheld by a Division Bench of this Court in *LPA No.2977 of 2024—State of Punjab and another v. Dr. Saurabh Sharma and others, decided on 10.12.2024*, wherein it has been held as under:-

“xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx

6. It is manifest that the respondents having been appointed under 2016 Rules were entitled to the pay scales as prescribed thereunder. Merely because in the advertisement/appointment letters, the State had prescribed a lower pay scale, the same cannot come in the way of the respondents, seeking the enforcement of their lawful rights of getting the pay scales as prescribed under the statutory rules. **It is trite that the executive instructions cannot override the statutory rules. In the event of the State intending to provide another or lower pay scales, the proper course to be adopted was the amendment of the rules. There is no dispute that the aforementioned rules have not been amended. Executive instructions would have the force of law only in the absence of statutory rules or to fill the gaps in the statutory rules which is not there in the case at hand.**

xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx

8. Reference can be made to the judgments of Supreme Court in the cases of *Union of India Vs. Majji Jangamayya, (1977) 1 SCC 606*, *Union of India Vs. Ashok Kumar Aggarwal, (2013) 16 SCC 147*, *Krishna Rai (dead) through LRs and others Vs. Banaras Hindu University through Registrar and others in Civil Appeal Nos.4578-4580 of 2022 decided on 16.06.2022* and *Civil Appeal No.152 of 2022 titled The Employees' State Insurance Corporation Vs. UOI and others, decided on 20.01.2022*, whereby it has been held that in the event of conflict between statement in advertisement and service regulations, latter shall prevail.

xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx”

15. The said judgment in *Sourabh Sharma's case (supra)* has been upheld by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Special Leave to Appeal(C) No.1158 of 2025 (The State of Punjab and another v. Saurabh Sharma and others), decided on 20.01.2025* and even *Review*

Petition No.400 of 2025 in Special Leave to Appeal(C) No.1158 of 2025 (The State of Punjab and another v. Saurabh Sharma and others) was also dismissed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court vide order dated 20.03.2025 and the said judgment has been implemented by the respondents after filing of ***COCF No.4877 of 2024 (Saurabh Sharma and others v. Ravi Bhagat, IAS and another), decided on 02.04.2025*** and has been followed by a Coordinate Bench of this Court in ***CWP No.32111-2025—Rajan v. State of Punjab and others, decided on 31.10.2025***. Further, for the delay caused in withholding the recommendations of the petitioners, they cannot be made to suffer and they are required to be treated at par with other Surveyors, who were appointed on 28.12.2016 for all intents and purposes.

So far as the contention raised by learned State counsel that due to stay granted in ***CWP No.5770 of 2017*** the delay has occurred in making the appointment of the petitioners is concerned, it may be noticed that when the recommendations of the other categories were sent to the Government for appointments and the recommendations with regard to the petitioners' category were withheld by the respondent-Board, there was no stay and the interim stay in the said writ petition was granted on 23.03.2017.

16. For the reasons recorded hereinabove, the present petition is allowed and the respondents are directed to grant the same pay scale to the petitioners i.e. Rs.5910-20200+2400 Grade Pay as further revised vide Punjab Civil Services (Revised Pay) Rules, 2021, at par with Surveyors appointed in the year 2016, with all consequential benefits by notionally granting them the same benefit as granted to the other

Surveyors appointed in the year 2016. However, the actual arrears be released to the petitioners with effect from their date of appointment, within a period of four months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order, with no order as to costs.

15.12.2025

Vinay

(NAMIT KUMAR)
JUDGE

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