



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

Serial No. 115

**CWP-32058-2025 (O&M)
Decided on: 07.11.2025**

Surbhi and others

. . . Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

. . . Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present: Mr. Namit Gautam, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Amit Sahni, Additional Advocate General, Haryana.

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J.(ORAL)

CM-16315-2025

Learned counsel for the applicant-petitioners does not press the application.

2. Dismissed as not pressed.

CWP-32058-2025

The petition has been filed *inter alia* seeking a writ of *certiorari* quashing the order dated 29.08.2025, Annexure P-8, passed by respondent no.2 whereby the petitioners' pay as Data Entry Operator has been re-fixed and reduced from the date of their joining the Department by superseding the earlier order dated 28.10.2024, Annexure P-7.

2025.PHHC.153430



2. On the last date of hearing, following order was passed:

It is, *inter alia*, contended that the petitioners were appointed as Data Entry Operators (DEO) after being deployed from Haryana State Electronics Development Corporation Limited (HARTRON). Their remuneration was revised and refixed in terms of Government letter dated 14.10.2024, Annexure P-6, vide office order dated 28.10.2024, Annexure P-7. However, without issuing any show cause notice or affording any opportunity of hearing, the order has been superseded by the subsequent impugned order dated 29.08.2025, Annexure P-8, whereby the petitioners' pay has been refixed and reduced with reference to letter dated 11.12.2023, Annexure P-9, issued by HARTRON to Director, Social Justice, Empowerment, Welfare of Scheduled Castes and Backward Classes and Antyodaya (SEWA) Department, regarding fixation of remuneration of DEOs deployed through HARTRON as per State Government Policy dated 07.01.2021. The letter is not addressed to the respondent/Department, and it has been issued with reference to a Policy which has already been superseded vide letter dated 14.10.2024, based upon which the petitioners' pay was refixed and increased. Accordingly, there is no basis to issue the impugned refixation order.

2. Learned State counsel, appearing on advance notice, seeks an adjournment to get instructions. ...

3. Learned State counsel has received instructions from respondent no.2, vide memo dated 07.11.2025, which has been retained on the case file as Annexure 'A'. Referring to the same, he contends that the competent authority has decided to re-consider the entire matter after giving due opportunity of



hearing to the petitioners which will take some time, and no recovery will be made from them based upon the impugned re-fixation order dated 29.08.2025.

4. In view thereof, the petition is disposed of directing the respondents to re-consider the matter accordingly. And till the final decision is taken, the impugned order dated 29.08.2025, shall not be given effect to. The petitioners are at liberty to raise the remaining prayers in accordance with law.

07.11.2025

Mehak

**(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE**

Whether reasoned/speaking? Yes/No

Whether reportable? Yes/No