



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

CWP-7400-2014 (O&M)

Date of Decision : 25-07-2025

HARI KRISHAN

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

.....Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. Jagdish Manchanda, Advocate for the petitioner.

 Mr. Rahul Rampal, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

 Mr. Swarn Sandhir, Advocate for respondent Nos. 2 and 3.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J. (Oral)

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that though, the claim of the petitioner in the writ petition is that the petitioner is not being granted the benefit of the pay scale of the Reader as recommended by the Shetty Pay Commission but, during the pendency of the present writ petition, the benefit has been granted to the petitioner from the year 2011 but the claim of the petitioner is that the same has not been granted from the date, the said benefit has been extended to the junior of the petitioner, which is causing prejudice to him.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that though, no such claim that the juniors have been granted the benefit of promotion is projected in the writ petition and there is no mention of any junior, who has been granted the benefit of the promotion to the post of Reader in preference to the petitioner and nothing has been brought on record that any junior was granted the pay scale prior to the date when the same was extended to the

petitioner i.e. 01.10.2011 hence, no such name has come up for consideration of the Department that any junior was promoted to the post of Reader prior to 01.10.2011 so as to consider his claim for the grant of said benefit from the date juniors were promoted.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the present petition may kindly be disposed of as having been not pressed any further with liberty to the petitioner to file a representation giving the detail of the juniors, who were promoted to the post of Reader prior to 01.10.2011 so as to claim the benefit of promotion from the said date.

4. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that in case, any representation is received by the competent authority with the details, the same will be examined and decided keeping in view of the record within a period of 8 weeks from the receipt of copy of this order by passing an appropriate speaking order and in case, it is found feasible, the same will be accepted otherwise, due reasons will be mentioned for not accepting the claim of the petitioner, which will be conveyed to the petitioner for his information and necessary action.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that keeping in view the view the statement of the learned counsel for the respondents, the present petition may kindly be disposed of as having been not pressed any further with liberty as prayed for.

6. Ordered accordingly.

7. Pending application, if any, also stands disposed of.

25-07-2025
Sapna Goyal

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

NOTE: Whether speaking: YES
Whether reportable: NO