



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

(258)

CWP No. 20075 of 2023 (O&M)

Date of Decision : 29.07.2025

Ramanpreet Singh Gill

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Yagyadeep, Advocate and  
Mr. Davinder Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Kanav Singla, A.A.G., Punjab.

\*\*\*

**Harsimran Singh Sethi J. (Oral)**

1. In the present petition, the grievance being raised by the petitioner is that he was an employee of the Government of Punjab and was posted at Chandigarh and, therefore, was entitled for the DC rate fixed by the Chandigarh Administration as per the Notification dated 28.08.2018 (Annexure P-5).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has to be paid the salary in accordance to the DC rate fixed by the Chandigarh Administration even if the petitioner is an employee of the Government of Punjab, when posted in U.T., Chandigarh.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents submits that the petitioner was an employee of the Government of Punjab and was working under Department of Public Works (B&R) having Head Office at



Patiala and keeping in view the DC rate fixed by the Deputy Commissioner, Patiala, the petitioner was being paid the salary for his service, which act on psart of respondents is perfectly and legal and the DC rate fixed by the Deputy Commissioner, Chandigarh only relates to the office of the Chandigarh Administration and employees working therein and hence, the claim of the petitioner by placing reliance upon Notification dated 28.08.2018 (Annexure P-5) is incorrect.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record with their able assistance.

5. Once, the petitioner is an employee of the Government of Punjab and was merely posted in Chandigarh, he cannot claim that he is entitled for minimum wages fixed by Chandigarh Administration for its employees. The petitioner was working at Chandigarh but was under the Supervisions of Head Office situated at Patiala and he was being paid the DC rate as fixed by the Deputy Commissioner, Patiala, the grievance being raised by the petitioner that he is entitled for payment of the DC rate fixed by the Chandigarh Administration is incorrect. The DC rate fixed by the Chandigarh Administration only concerns the employees working in Offices of the Chandigarh Administration within the jurisdiction of U.T., Chandigarh.

6. A bare perusal of Notification dated 28.08.2018 (Annexure P-5) would show that the said minimum rate of wages including Dearness Allowance for the Government employee to be paid in various Departments of Chandigarh District has been fixed, which clearly shows that the same relates to the employees of the Chandigarh Administration who are posted in



Chandigarh. The claim of the benefit of the said Notification dated 28.08.2018 (Annexure P-5) with regard to the employees of the State of Punjab is not made out.

7. No ground is made out for any interference by this Court in the present petition.

8. Dismissed.

9. Pending miscellaneous application, if any, also stands disposed of.

July 29, 2025  
*kanchan*

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)  
JUDGE

*Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes*

*Whether reportable : No*