



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

LPA-1026-2026 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 17.04.2026

NIRMAL SINGH SANDHU

.....APPELLANT(S)

VERSUS

UNION TERRITORY CHANDIGARH ADMINISTRATION THROUGH ITS
ADMINISTRATOR ...RESPONDENT(S)

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ROHIT KAPOOR**

Present: Mr. R. C. Sharma, Advocate
Mr. Shivaansh Gulati, Advocate and
Mr. Shivam Bansal, Advocate for the appellant.
Ms. Madhu Dayal, Advocate and
Ms. Chetna Thakur, Advocate
for the respondent No.2-CITCO.

ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA, J. (Oral)

CM-2519-LPA-2026 (delay)

1. This application under Section 5 of the Limitation Act has been filed on behalf of the applicants-appellants seeking condonation of delay of 422 days in filing the instant appeal.

2. For the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is **allowed** and delay of 422 days in filing the present appeal stands condoned.

Main Case (O&M)

3. Appellant is aggrieved by rejection of his claim for higher pay scale w.e.f. 22.07.1988 in place of 01.07.1989.

4. It transpires that the appellant was appointed as Banquet Manager and was placed in the pay scale of Rs.825-1580 plus usual allowances. The pay scale was revised from Rs.850-1580 to Rs.1640-2900, vide the respondent's order dated 21.11.1988 (Annexure R-5), consequent to the revision of pay scales of employees of the Chandigarh Administration. Representations made in that regard by the appellant came to be rejected in the year 1997. Aggrieved by such rejection of appellant's representation, the writ petition was filed in the year 1998.

5. Before the learned Single Judge, a reply was filed by the respondents, according to which the employees of Chandigarh Industrial & Tourism Development Corporation Limited (for short, 'CITCO') were being paid salaries as per Central Government rules. However, the Board of Directors, in 1989, reconsidered the matter and by way of a circular dated 24.11.1992, decided to adopt the Punjab pay pattern. A Committee was constituted to reconsider the anomaly in the pay scale, as the designations available in Punjab were at variance with those existing in the Central structure.

6. A Pay Anomaly Committee was constituted, which invited objections from employees and upon consideration of such objections, rejected their claims. It was found by the Committee that no discrimination had been meted out to similarly placed employees. The disparity in pay was found to be on account of differences in the nature of work, responsibilities, qualifications, etc. It was also noted that no *mala fide* was alleged against the Directors or other officials.

7. The learned Single Judge has gone through the material on record and ultimately found no substance in the writ petition, which was accordingly dismissed *vide* order dated 03.02.2025. Aggrieved by this order, the appellant is before this Court.

8. We have perused the representation of the appellant, as well as the order by which the said representation was rejected.

9. It appears that the appellant was working as a Banquet Manager with CITCO and had claimed a higher pay scale from the date of his joining. The material on record indicates that the pay scale of a Banquet Manager, as per the notification, was Rs.2000-3500, whereas a different pay scale was prescribed for those promoted from internal sources. The recommendations of the Pay Anomaly Committee and the consequential notifications were not under challenge. The grievance raised by the appellant was found to be without substance and was consequently rejected.

10. It is undisputed that the appellant was issued a subsequent

appointment in the year 1989, which prescribed the requisite pay scale for the post of Banquet Manager, and such appointment was accepted by him. In these circumstances, the subsequent attempt on his part to claim a higher pay scale has rightly been rejected by the learned Single Judge and requires no interference.

11. In that view of the matter, the instant appeal fails and is accordingly *dismissed*.
12. All pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

[ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA]
JUDGE

[ROHIT KAPOOR]
JUDGE

APRIL 17, 2026
Rahul Joshi

1. Whether Speaking/reasoned
2. Whether Reportable
- Yes/No
Yes/No