



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

133

CWP-13252-2026

Date of decision: 30.04.2026

Manpreet Garg

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAMIT KUMAR

Present : Mr. Ankush Thakral, Advocate for the petitioner.

NAMIT KUMAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, claiming the following reliefs:-

“i. To issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to fix/re-fix the pay of the petitioner in the regular statutory pay scale/pay matrix applicable to the post of Patwari, i.e. Rs. 10,300-34,800 with Grade Pay of Rs. 3,200 along with all subsequent pay revisions, with effect from the due date, and to make necessary corrections in the iHRMS/service record of the petitioner, along with all consequential benefits including arrears and interest @ 12% per annum, in light of the law laid down by this Hon'ble Court in CWP-15896 of 2023, titled as 'Saurabh Sharma and others vs. State of Punjab and another, which stands upheld upto the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India.

ii. In the alternative and without prejudice to the aforesaid prayers, this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to issue an appropriate writ, order directing the respondents, in particular respondent no.4, to forthwith consider and decide the representation dated 24.12.2025 (P-11) submitted by the petitioner by passing a speaking order in time bound manner, strictly in consonance with consonance with instructions dated 05.01.2026 (P-13) issued by respondent no.2 and the law laid down by this Hon'ble Court in CWP-15896 of 2023 titled as 'Saurabh

Sharma and others vs. State of Punjab and others'

Iii. With a further prayer that this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus declaring that the instructions dated 17.07.2020 (P-14) issued by the Finance Department are not applicable to the case of the petitioner, inasmuch as the petitioner was inducted into service prior to the issuance of the said instructions and his service conditions are governed by the statutory rules and pay structure as per rules prevailing at the time of his appointment/induction.

xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx”

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that for redressal of his grievances, the petitioner has also made a representation dated 24.12.2025 (Annexure P-11) to the respondents which is still pending consideration. He further submits that at this stage, the petitioner would be satisfied, if appropriate directions are issued to the respondents to consider and decide the said representation, by passing a speaking order, in a time bound manner.

3. Notice of motion.

4. On receipt of advance copy, Mr. Kanav Singla, AAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents. He has no objection to the innocuous prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record of the case.

6. Without going into the merits of the case at this stage, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.4 to decide the representation dated 24.12.2025 (Annexure P-11) submitted by the petitioner expeditiously, by passing a speaking order after affording an opportunity of hearing to him, preferably within a period

of 04 months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.
Further, the decision taken thereon shall be conveyed to the petitioner.

30.04.2026

Vinay

(NAMIT KUMAR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No