

2026.PHHC:050952



252.

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

CWP-27372-2025

Date of decision: 02.04.2026

Robin Khunger

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAMIT KUMAR

Present: Mr. Ranjit Singh Kalra, Advocate, and
Ms. Mona Yadav, Advocate,
Ms. Apurva Walia, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Swapan Shorey, DAG, Punjab.

NAMIT KUMAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The instant writ petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, seeking a writ in the nature of mandamus, directing the respondents to extend benefits of service and salary at par with the employees, who were appointed in the same selection i.e. in the pay scale of Rs.10300-34800+3200 GP along with arrears of salary with interest @ 18% per annum, as amended vide 6th Pay Commission in the Pay Band of Rs.33300+ admissible allowances and also give notional benefits; and to re-decide the legal notice dated 29.04.2025 (Annexure P-13), in a time bound manner; further, seeking for issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing the letter dated 06.06.2025 (Annexure P-14), as the claim of the petitioner has been rejected without any application of mind and in a

discriminatory manner, inspite of the fact the same being squarely covered by the decision rendered in ***Saurabh Sharma and others Versus State of Punjab and others, CWP No.15896 of 2023, decided on 13.09.2024 (Annexure P-7)***, which was upheld in ***LPA No.2977 of 2024, decided on 10.12.2024 (Annexure P-8)*** and even in ***SLP (C) No.1158 of 2025, decided on 20.01.2025 (Annexure P-9)***, as also without considering that the issue in the present selection has also been decided in ***CWP No.26271 of 2022- Arvinder Singh and others Versus State of Punjab and others, decided on 14.10.2024 (Annexure P-11)***; further, seeking for quashing of appointment letter dated 18.12.2020 (Annexure P-5) to the extent whereby the petitioner has been put on the lower pay scale, as being extended to the counterparts appointed against the same advertisement.

2. On 09.01.2026, the following order was passed:-

*“Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) submits that the instant petitions are squarely covered by a judgment of this Court in **Gurpreet Singh and others v. State of Punjab and others: 2025(2) SLR 771 and CWP No.27082 of 2022 titled as 'Meena Bharti and others v. State of Punjab and others', decided on 06.09.2024**, which has also been implemented by the respondents.*

Learned State counsel seeks an adjournment to get instructions in this regard and to file written statement in CWP-32733- 2025.

Let the needful be done before the next date of hearing with copy in advance to the learned counsel for the petitioner(s).

Adjourned to 29.01.2026.

A photocopy of this order be placed on the files of other connected cases.”

Thereafter, on 25.03.2026, the following order was passed:-

“Learned State counsel seeks short adjournment to get instructions in terms of order dated 09.01.2026.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has produced copy of the sanction dated 06.03.2026 granted by the Government of Punjab, Department of Finance, whereby the claim of similarly situated persons has been accepted.

Adjourned to 02.04.2026.

A photocopy of this order be placed on the files of connected cases."

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has produced copy of the sanction letter dated 06.03.2026 issued by the Government of Punjab, Department of Finance, whereby the Administrative Department has been advised to fix the salary in the same manner in which the salary of their batchmates has been fixed. The copy of said sanction letter is taken on record. Learned counsel reiterates the submissions that the case is squarely covered by the ratio laid down in ***Gurpreet Singh and others Versus State of Punjab and others, 2025(2) SLR 771*** wherein it has been held that there cannot be different pay scale/pay band/grade pay for the same very post in the same department.

4. Learned State counsel, despite his best efforts, could not dispute the above said assertion of the learned counsel for the petitioner.

5. Keeping in view the above, the present petition is disposed of in terms of judgment in ***Gurpreet Singh's case (supra)***. The necessary benefits shall be released to the petitioner, within a period of three months, from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

(NAMIT KUMAR)
JUDGE

02.04.2026
sanjeev

Whether speaking/reasoned:
Whether reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No