

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

118

**CM-3272-LPA-2025 in/and
LPA-1333-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision :22.07.2025****State of Punjab and others****... Appellants****Versus****Rajesh Bagha****...Respondent****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA**

Present: Ms. Arundhati Kulshreshtha, AAG Punjab
for the appellants.

**********Anupinder Singh Grewal, J. (Oral)****CM-3272-LPA-2025**

This is an application for condonation of delay of 153 days in filing the appeal.

Learned counsel for the applicants/appellants submits that the matter had to be processed at various levels and therefore, the delay has occurred in filing the appeal.

Issue notice in the application to the non-applicant-respondent.

At the asking of the Court, Mr. Gurnoor Singh Sandhu, Advocate accepts notice on behalf of the respondent and submits that he has no objection if the delay is condoned.

Heard. For the reasons stated in the application, the same is allowed. The delay of 153 days in filing the appeal is condoned.

Main case

Learned counsel for the appellants submits that the respondent, who was working as the Chairman of the Punjab State Scheduled Caste Commission, had accepted the terms and conditions, which stipulated his salary/honorarium to be fixed at Rs.25,000/- and therefore, he cannot claim any increase in the subsequent revision. The subsequent revision, which would take effect from when



the order of revision dated 05.10.2016 was passed. Therefore, the revision would be applicable w.e.f. that date and not retrospectively. A clarification has also been issued to this effect by the Finance Department on 06.12.2016.

2. Heard.

3. The respondent had been appointed as the Chairman of the Punjab State Scheduled Caste Commission on 29.11.2011. In the terms and conditions set out in the order dated 28.06.2012, his salary/honorarium was fixed at Rs.25,000/-. However, the competent authority superseded the order dated 28.06.2012 by the order dated 05.10.2016 whereby the honorarium/salary of the said Chairman was fixed at Rs.1,00,000/- per month. Once an order has been passed superseding the previous order, it would relate back to the date of the previous order. The petitioner had been appointed to the said post on 29.11.2011 and therefore, on the basis of order dated 05.10.2016 superseding the previous order he would be entitled to a salary/honorarium of Rs.1,00,000/- per month from the date of his appointment. We do not find any illegality in the order of the Single Bench to this effect.

4. The argument of the learned counsel for the appellants that the Finance Department had approved a sum of Rs.80,000/- does not merit acceptance for the reason that once the competent authority has passed an order, fixing the salary/honorarium, the same ought to be complied with and implemented.

5. Consequently, the appeal being devoid of any merit stands dismissed.

6. All pending miscellaneous application(s) shall also stand disposed of.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

22.07.2025

Sapna

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