

2026.PHHC.049863



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

107

RA-CW-150-2024 in CWP-15769-2022

Date of decision: April 01, 2026

RINKAL DABRA

...Applicant/Petitioner

Versus

UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present: Mr. Manoj Kumar Taya, Advocate
for the applicant/petitioner.

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J. (ORAL)

The application has been filed seeking review of the order dated 22.07.2022, whereby the applicant/petitioner's challenge to impugned judgment passed by the Educational Tribunal dated 08.03.2022, Annexure P-3, has been declined by observing as under:

The petitioner had been appointed as Assistant Professor with respondent No.5-College and was given a consolidated pay of Rs.21600/-. Later his salary had been increased to Rs.26,300/-. I am in agreement with the finding of the Tribunal that the petitioner was, therefore, getting salary more than the minimum of the pay scale. The petitioner was an employee of a private unaided self financed institution and, therefore, he could not claim salary of a regular employee of Government aided college/Government College. The petitioner has sought a claim of Rs.11,39,563/- towards difference in salary but the calculation and the break up as to how this amount has been worked out, is not forthcoming. The petitioner has raised claim after 03 years of having left service.

Consequently, I do not find any infirmity in the order of the Educational Tribunal while exercising writ jurisdiction.

The petition stands dismissed.

2. Learned counsel contended that certain important documents which were part of the record before the Tribunal, were not considered while passing the aforementioned order. For instance, proceedings of the meeting of selection committee recommending the petitioner for appointment which were approved by the affiliating University vide letter dated 03.05.2010, Annexure A-6 (Ex.A-4 before the Tribunal). It was with a stipulation that the candidate be issued appointment letter clearly mentioning the pay scale and other terms and conditions of appointment, under intimation to the University. Also, the intimation sent by the College, Annexure P-13, which was to the effect that the petitioner had joined as Assistant Professor on permanent basis on 23.02.2010 with a pay scale of ₹15600-39100, was not considered. These documents established that he was entitled to salary in the regular pay scale which was not given.

3. Considering the submissions, this Court finds no ground to review the order dated 22.07.2022, as all the relevant facts have been taken into account before passing the same. Even on the basis of the documents referred to by learned counsel for the applicant/petitioner it cannot be said that his appointment was not on a consolidated salary of ₹21600, on the terms and conditions mentioned in the letter of appointment dated 25.02.2010. Merely because the College intimated the University about the appointment being in a particular pay scale, it would not establish the

petitioner’s entitlement to the same as it could not be shown the scale was admissible under the terms of his appointment. It could also not be disputed that after approval of the petitioner’s appointment by the affiliating University on 03.05.2010, he worked on the consolidated salary for about four years till submission of resignation on 19.03.2014, and approached the Tribunal thereafter.

4. The application, accordingly, stands dismissed.

April 01, 2026
Jaspreet Kaur

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE

✓

Whether speaking/reasoned : *Yes/No*

Whether reportable : *Yes/No*