



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

115

CWP-16421-2026

Date of decision : 25.05.2026

Amarjeet Kaur and another

....Petitioners

V/S

State of Punjab and others

....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAMIT KUMAR

Present: Mr. Rakesh Sobti, Advocate for the petitioners.

NAMIT KUMAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioners have filed the instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, seeking issuance of a writ of certiorari for quashing the letter/order dated 21.04.2026 (Annexure P-24), whereby the respondents have declined to grant the benefit of re-revised pay scale of Rs.10300-34800 with grade pay of Rs.3200 w.e.f. 01.12.2011 pursuant to the recommendations of the 5th Punjab Pay Commissioner Implemented through the Punjab Civil Services (Revised Pay) Rules, 2009 effecting from 01.01.2006 (Annexure P-4), to the petitioners. Further, seeking issuance of a writ of mandamus directing the respondents to grant/re-fix the pay of the petitioners in the abovesaid revised pay scale at par with similarly situated employees/categories including Clerks, Constables, Restorers, Photostat Machine Operators, Patwaris, Gate Keepers, Warders and Gram Sewaks, who were drawing the same pay scales during the earlier pay commissions and have already been granted the aforesaid benefit.

**CWP-16421-2026****2**

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that apart from the other grounds which have been taken in the present writ petition, one of the ground to challenge the order dated 21.04.2026 (Annexure P-24), whereby the claim of the petitioners for grant the benefit of re-revised pay scale has been rejected, is that the same is cryptic and non-speaking order as no reasons have been assigned therein while rejecting the claim of the petitioners. He further submits that the impugned order is nonest in the eyes of law and is liable to be set aside and the matter may be remanded back to the respondent-department for reconsideration.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. Satnampreet Singh Chauhan, D.A.G., Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the respondents and has fairly conceded that the impugned order dated 21.04.2026 (Annexure P-24) is non-speaking and ambiguous and has no objection to the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant documents.

6. The impugned order dated 21.04.2026 (Annexure P-24), passed by the respondent-department reads as under:-

“With reference to the Legal Notice dated 26-5-2025 I am directed to state that the claim made by your client's for re-revision of pay scale w.e.f 1.12.2011 is wholly untenable and devoid of merit. The re-revision of pay scale carried out in the year 2011 has already been declared 'Non-est' by the 6 Punjab Pay Commission. Consequently, any claim arising out of or based upon the said re-revision lacks legal standing and cannot be sustained.



CWP-16421-2026

3

In view of the above, your client's are not entitled to any benefit on the basis of the said re-revision and these both employees are getting the pay scales as per Pay Rules 2021 notified on 05-07-2021.”.

7. The respondent/department were under legal obligation to assign valid and cogent reasons while passing the impugned order dated 21.04.2026 (Annexure P-24) so that this Court, while exercising its power of judicial review, may be in a position to know as to what were the reasons weighing in the mind of the authority, while passing of the impugned order. However, perusal of the impugned order reproduced above would show that no reasons have been assigned while rejecting the claim of the petitioners.

8. In view of the above, the present petition is partly allowed. Impugned order dated 21.04.2026 (Annexure P-24), passed by the respondent/department, is set-aside and the case is remanded back to the respondent/department for fresh consideration and decision on merits and to pass well reasoned speaking order, within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order after affording an opportunity of personal hearing to the petitioners.

25.05.2026

kothiyal

(NAMIT KUMAR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes/No

Whether Reportable:

Yes/No