



LPA-551-2025 (O&M)

-1-

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

107

LPA-551-2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 21.02.2025

Dariya Singh

..... Appellant

Versus

State of Haryana and others

..... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA**

Present: Mr. Parveen Chauhan, Advocate
for the appellant.

SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA, J (ORAL)

CM-1412-LPA-2025

This is an application for condonation of delay of 229 days in re-filing the present appeal.

For the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is allowed and the delay of 229 days in re-filing the present appeal is hereby condoned.

Application stands disposed of.

CM-1413-LPA-2025

This is an application for condonation of delay of 2059 days in filing the present appeal.

For the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is allowed and the delay of 2059 days in filing the present appeal is hereby condoned.

Application stands disposed of.



LPA-551-2025 (O&M)

-2-

Main Case

1. The present appeal has been preferred by the appellant assailing the order dated 02.08.2018 passed by the learned Single Judge, whereby the writ petition filed by the writ petitioner (now herein appellant) was dismissed.

2. We find that the appellant who is working as a Senior Draftsman in the Mines and Geology Department, claims the same pay-scale as that of Senior Draftsman in Architecture Department as well as Town and Country Planning Department. The claim of the appellant is based on the recommendations made by the superior authorities. However, we find that the post of Senior Draftsman which is available in three different Departments, namely, Mines and Geology, Town and Country Planning as well as Architecture Department, may have similar or different areas and sphere of work but it is not for this Court to grant equivalence of posts and is an exclusive work for the concerned State Pay Commission.

3. The appellant has always a remedy to raise a dispute and claim before the Pay Anomaly Committee, who would be in a position to examine the matter. Learned Single Judge has observed that merely because the designation and nomenclature are the same, it does not mean that there is pay anomaly or the posts are absolutely one and the same to support the case of the appellant. The appellant is already recipient of an unfair advantage from the beginning enjoying higher pay-scale (but with pay protection) and, therefore, he is not in my view entitled as a matter of right to any of the claims made in this appeal.

4. In view thereto, the order passed by the learned Single Judge

**LPA-551-2025 (O&M)****-3-**

does not warrant any interference and accordingly, the instant appeal is dismissed.

5. The pending misc. application, if any, shall stands disposed of accordingly.

(SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA)
JUDGE

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

21.02.2025
D.Bansal

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