



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

204

CWP-26970-2016

Date of Decision: 07.08.2025

Jagjit Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

Director General and others

....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS SURI**

Present: Mr. C.L.Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vishal Aggarwal, Advocate and
Mr. G.S.Sarao, Advocate
for respondents No.1 and 2.

Harsimran Singh Sethi, J. (Oral)

1. In the present petition, the grievance being raised by the petitioner-employee is that the claim regarding upgradation of pay scale under the ACP Scheme w.e.f. 26.01.2001 on completion of 24 years of service of the petitioner which has wrongly been rejected by the Tribunal while passing the order dated 03.08.2016 (Annexure P-15).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner claimed the benefit of pay scale of Rs.1400-2300/- on promotion to the post of Head Electrician. Learned counsel submits that the petitioner was promoted

*CWP-26970-2016*

-: 2 :-

after the retirement of one Laxman Dass, who retired on 31.12.1993 and as Laxman Dass was getting the pay scale of Rs.1400-2300/-, the respondents were under obligation to grant the said pay scale to the petitioner as well, which fact has not been appreciated by the Tribunal in the correct perspective and therefore, the order passed by the Tribunal dated 03.08.2016 (Annexure P-15) may kindly be set aside and the respondents be directed to grant the petitioner the pay scale of Rs.1400-2300/- while working on the post of Head Electrician.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents submits that the finding has been recorded in para 9 by the Tribunal while passing the order dated 03.08.2016 (Annexure P-15) that at no given point of time the pay scale of Rs.1400-2300/- was granted to the post of Head Electrician.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has not been able to show any relevant document that any given point of time the pay scale of the post of Head Electrician was revised from Rs.1200-1800/- to Rs.1400-2300/-. In the absence of any such material evidence brought before the Tribunal, the finding recorded by the Tribunal needs no interference by this Court.

5. Further, it may be noticed that for the same purpose, the petitioner had earlier filed an original application which came to be dismissed by the Tribunal against which, the petitioner filed a writ petition before this Court, being CWP No.20575-2008, which was withdrawn to file a representation. Once, the earlier judgment of the Tribunal on the same cause of action had already rejected the said relief, the second original application was not maintainable and rejecting the claim of the petitioner on the said ground by the Tribunal also needs no interference.



CWP-26970-2016

-: 3 :-

6. No ground is made out for interference by this Court.
7. The present writ petition is dismissed.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

(VIKAS SURJ)
JUDGE

August 07, 2025

Varinder

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : No