



COC-2699-2025

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(207)

COC-2699-2025

Date of decision: - 20.05.2026

Ramesh Kumar and others

....Petitioners

Versus

Sudhir Rajpal and another

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present:- Mr. R.K. Malik, Senior Advocate, with
Mr. Sandeep Dhull, Advocate, and
Mr. D.S. Mann, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Raj Partap Singh Brar, AAG, Haryana.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. On 13.05.2026, this Court was pleased to pass the following
order: -

*Present:- Mr. R.K. Malik, Senior Advocate, with
Mr. D.S. Mann, Advocate, and
Mr. Ankur Sheoran, Advocate
for the petitioners.*

Mr. Tarun Aggarwal, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

*Learned senior counsel for the petitioners has
submitted that the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated
12.07.2024 had allowed the writ petition of the petitioners with the
following observations: -*

*“11. It is evident that parity between the pay scales of
Radiographers and Lab Technicians was maintained throughout,
from 1976 right upto 2009, when the former were granted a scale
higher than the latter. The Commission, constituted to look into
the grievances stemming out from this action, accepted the plea of*



the employees while taking into consideration the duties and responsibilities of both posts and recommended the same pay band for them. The State, without listing any cogent reasons, imposed a cut off date of 2016 for grant of the due instead of 2006. It is thus iniquitous and unacceptable in law as the same does not stand the test of Article 14 of the Constitution of India, which postulates equality before the law and equal protection of the laws.

12. *On an analysis of the factual matrix, in light of the afore-referred judgments, the respondents were required to revise the pay scale of the petitioners from 01.01.2006, when the anomaly arose and grant them consequential benefits flowing therefrom.*

13. *The writ petition is accordingly allowed.*

12.07.2024”

It is further submitted that the respondents had challenged the said order and the Division Bench of this Court vide judgment dated 02.02.2026 had dismissed the appeal with the following observations: -

“7. *Accordingly, the present appeal fails and is dismissed.*

8. *The State shall ensure that all benefits in terms of the judgment of the learned Single Judge is released within a period of three months from today, failing which respondents would also be entitled to interest @ 6%.*

9. *All pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.”*

It is argued that the said judgment of the Division Bench has been annexed with the status report dated 12.05.2026 and in spite of lapse of three months, till date the benefits have not been released to the petitioners.

On 07.04.2026, this Court was pleased to pass the following order: -

*'Present: Mr. Ankur Sheoran, Advocate
for the petitioners.*



*Mr. Raj Pratap Singh Brar, Assistant Advocate
General, Haryana.*

*Learned counsel for the respondents has submitted that
the period of three months as granted by the LPA Bench would
elapse on 02.05.2026.*

Adjourned to 13.05.2026.

*Last opportunity is granted to the respondents to submit
compliance report.*

To be shown in the urgent list.

April 7th, 2026”

*Neither compliance report has been submitted nor the
benefits have been released to the petitioners. Nothing has been
shown to indicate that there is any stay on the judgment of the
Division Bench.*

*When this Court was about to proceed with the matter,
learned State counsel has vehemently requested that one last
opportunity be given for submitting compliance report.*

Adjourned to 20.05.2026.

To be taken up at 11:00 A.M.

*In case the needful/compliance is not done, the Officer
presently holding the office of Additional Chief Secretary, who is
stated to be Dr. Sumita Misra, as well as respondent No.2 are
directed to be present on the next date of hearing through video
conferencing.*

May 13, 2026”

2. Learned counsel for the respondents, on instructions from
Mr. Dinesh Kumar, DDA, Office of Director General, Health Services,
Haryana, Panchkula, has submitted that against the judgment of the LPA
Bench, the SLP has been filed and although the said LPA has been



dismissed but the Hon'ble Supreme Court has granted time up to 31.08.2026 for compliance of the order passed by the High Court. It is specifically submitted that the compliance of the order would be made by 31.08.2026 and in case for any reasons, the same is not done and the petitioners have to file a revival application of the present case, then, the respondents would pay an additional amount of Rs.50,000/-, as litigation expenses, in addition to the amount which is due to the petitioners.

3. Learned senior counsel for the petitioners has submitted that in view of the above, the present contempt petition be disposed of, but the respondents be bound by the said statement made before this Court and liberty be granted to the petitioners to revive the present contempt petition in case the respondents back track from the said statement.

4. Keeping in view the above-said facts and circumstances, the present contempt petition is disposed of. The respondents would be bound by the statement made before this Court.

5. It is made clear that in case, the respondents back track from the said statement and the petitioners are required to file an application for revival of the present contempt petition, then, as undertaken before this Court, the respondents, in addition to other action, would be liable to pay an amount of Rs.50,000/-, as litigation expenses, over and above the amount which is payable to the petitioners.

May 20, 2026
naresh.k

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes
No