



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

204

CWP-15748-2019

Date of decision: 13.01.2026

Ajit Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAMIT KUMAR

Present : Mr. Vivek Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Swapan Shorey, DAG, Punjab.

NAMIT KUMAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, for claiming the following reliefs:-

“i. to issue a writ in the nature of Certiorari quashing order dated 28.10.2018 (Annexure P-14) issued by the Respondents vide which the speaking order has been passed vide which the claim of the Petitioner with regard to Leave Travel Concession (LTC) has been rejected and the Respondents have decided to issue show cause notice to the Petitioner with a malafide intention and further removal of the red entries from the service book of the Petitioner made by the Respondent no.3 has been declined without any justification and further the case of the Petitioner with regard to pay parity with junior has also not been decided and directed the Petitioner to move a fresh representation separately to Director General Secondary Education (DGSE), without any justification.

ii. to issue a writ in the nature of Mandamus directing the Respondents to grant the LTC amount to the Petitioner, with all consequential benefits with 18% penal interest, which the Petitioner has raised and the Respondents without any justification is not granting.

iii. to restore the pay parity given to the Petitioner with his

junior w.e.f. 1.1.2006, which has illegally been withdrawn by the Respondent No.3 and any recovery may refund with 18% penal interest and further the arrears be also released with 18% penal interest.

iv. to issue further writ in the nature of Mandamus directing the Respondent no.1 to take strict action on the complaint/representation dated 19.1.2018 (Annexure P-9) submitted by the Petitioner and the guilty official/Respondent No.3 be punished accordingly for doing the illegality and harassing the Petitioner unnecessarily by misusing her position and to remove the red entries made by the her in the service book of the Petitioner, without issuing any notice to the Petitioner and without taking permission from the department.

v. to issue a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the Respondents to produce the service book of the Petitioner and then this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to quash the red entries/papers being attached by Respondent No.3 in a malafide manner without calling the Petitioner.

xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx”

2. While issuing notice of motion on 06.09.2019, the following order was passed:-

“Inter alia contends that not only the adverse entries in the service book of the petitioner have not been conveyed to him but the benefit to pay parity granted to him way back in the year 2006 has been withdrawn without passing any orders.

Learned counsel for the petitioner relies upon the salary statement of the petitioner contained at Annexure P-11, which reflects that in September, 2015, he was getting gross total of Rs.61302/- and all of sudden in October, 2015 his gross total has been reduced to Rs.60625/- without assigning any reasons.

Notice of motion for 26.03.2020.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has restricted his prayer only with regard to reduction of his pay and reiterates the contention, as has been recorded in the order dated 06.09.2019, and submits that while reducing the pay of the petitioner neither any show cause notice has

been issued to the petitioner nor an opportunity of hearing has been afforded and the action of the respondents is in violation of the principles of natural justice.

4. Learned State counsel could not refute the said contention.

5. In view of the above, the present petition is partly allowed and the action of the respondents in reducing the pay of the petitioner is held to be in violation of the principles of natural justice and is set aside.

6. However, liberty is granted to the respondents-State to reconsider the matter after following the due procedure of law, within a period of three months from the receipt of certified copy of this order.

7. Disposed of in the above terms.

13.01.2026

Vinay

(NAMIT KUMAR)
JUDGE

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