



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

Date of Decision: 01.08.2025

1. CWP-33069-2019

Satnam Singh		...Petitioner
	Versus	
State of Punjab and Others		...Respondents

2. CWP-33779-2019

Jaswinder Singh and Others		...Petitioners
	Versus	
State of Punjab and Others		...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. Baljeet Singh Sidhu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Aman Dhir, DAG, Punjab.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. As common issues are involved in the captioned petitions, with the consent of both sides, the same are hereby disposed of by this common order. For the sake of brevity and convenience, facts are borrowed from **CWP-33069-2019**.

2. On 15.11.2019, the following order was passed:

“Inter alia, contends that vide show cause notice dated 17.10.2019, the pay of the petitioner is proposed to be fixed with effect from 13.06.1998 instead of 18.07.1995 and that too after a period of 19 years.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been working as Senior Police Constable since the year 1993 and his pay was rightly fixed with

effect from 18.07.1995 and it is too belated at this stage to refix his salary on the ostensible plea of removing the pay anomaly.

Notice of motion.

On advance service of the petition, Ms. Monica Chhibber Sharma, Sr. DAG, Punjab appears and accepts notice on behalf of the respondents and seeks time to file reply. Adjourned to 14.01.2020.

In the meantime, it is expected of the respondents not to pass any adverse orders pursuant to the show cause notice.”

3. By impugned show cause notice, the respondent has attempted to revise pay scale. The petitioner was granted pay scale at par with lady Constable Paramjit Kaur w.e.f. 18.07.1995. The respondent is claiming that petitioner was entitled w.e.f. 13.06.1998. The amount involved on account of change of pay scale from 13.06.1998 instead of 18.07.1995 would be very small. It would not be more than few thousands. The benefit was extended 19 years back from the date of impugned notice.

4. The State has not furnished any plausible reason for aforesaid show cause notice.

5. Considering the amount and period involved, this Court finds it appropriate to make interim order absolute.

6. ***Disposed of.***

7. It is made clear that this order shall not be treated as precedent.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

01.08.2025
Prince Chawla

Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No