



CWP-10059-2026

-1-

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

Sr. No. 120

CWP-10059-2026

Decided on:04.05.2026

Shashi Kanta

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

PRESENT: Mr. Rajesh Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J.(ORAL)

The petitioner has approached this Court seeking a writ of *mandamus* directing the respondents to grant him the benefit of revised pay scale with appropriate grade pay with effect from 01.01.2006 along with consequential benefits.

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

It is *inter alia* contended that the petitioner was initially working as Principal in Industrial Training and Vocational Education, Panipat, up to 28.04.2009. His (her) services were merged with the School Education Department as Vocational Lecturer in Sociology in grade pay of ₹4200 on 29.04.2009, and he (she) retired from service on 31.01.2012. There was disparity in the pay scale with that of existing Lecturers in the Department who were placed in the pay scale of ₹4800. Some other employees approached this Court by filing writ petitions, including CWP-10269-2010, *Makhan Singh and others v. State of Haryana and another*, which was allowed vide order dated



23.09.2015, directing the Department to remove the disparity and grant grade pay of ₹4800 to Vocational Lecturers as well. Later, the Department generalised the benefits and gave notional scale to all similarly situated employees, like the petitioner herein, with effect from 01.01.2006 and actual benefits with prospective date effect vide office order dated 28.03.2017, Annexure P-4. However, the benefits have not been released to the petitioner despite several representations.

2. Ms. Tanushree Gupta, Senior Deputy Advocate General, Haryana, appearing on advance notice, seeks an adjournment to get instructions.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Ms. Tanushree Gupta, Senior Deputy Advocate General, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents/State and on instructions, submits that the Department will take a considered view on the petitioner's pending representation dated 13.03.2026, Annexure P-7, in the light of the submissions recorded above, which will be decided by respondent no.2/Director General, Secondary Education, by passing a speaking order in accordance with law within three months.

5. In view of the statement made, learned counsel for the petitioner has no objection to the petition being disposed of in terms thereof.

6. Ordered accordingly.

7. In case the order is not passed, the officer concerned shall pay costs of ₹50,000 to the petitioner.

04.05.2026

Mehak

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking? Yes/No
Whether reportable? ~~Yes~~/No