



**Dr. Krishan Lal**  
B.Sc., B.Ed., M.A., M.Com., Ph.D.  
Retd. Lecturer Political Sc.  
H. No. 181, Ward No. 3  
Bhagat Singh Marg, Near Naveen School,  
BUDHLADA -151502 Distt. Mansa (Punjab)

Website : www.krishanahelp.com  
Email : drkrishan365@gmail.com. info@krishanahelp.com  
M : Punjab 098157-13297, 095692-30568  
084272-03297, 084272-03298  
Whats App No. 9815713297, 9915031482  
Office : 9041013814 -19 (6 Lines)  
Office Time: 10:00 am to 1:00 pm, 4:00pm to 7:00 pm

A consultancy firm to provide help for the problems of govt. employees & retired pensioners

## **SLA / Library Restorer 10300-34800+3200 ਗਰੇਡ ਏ ਲੈਣ ਲਈ ਸੰਪਰਕ ਕਰਨ:**

It is on the record of the Department/Govt. that the duties of Senior Lab Attendant, which are supervisory and are of responsibilities in nature and initial basic qualification for recruitment is matriculation with Science. Consequently since 1978 they were placed in the pay scale of 400-600 equivalent to the pay scale admissible to the clerk who have qualification of Matriculation then.

The 5<sup>th</sup> pay commission in para 5.63 while considering the demands of the education employees in this sector has made as following recommendation:-

5.63 Laboratory staff in school be given higher pay scale in view of the significance of their assignment.

The Govt. of Punjab having accepted recommendation that Laboratory staff should have been given higher pay scale of 10300-34800+grade pay Rs. 3200 minimum pay of Rs. 13500/- instead of revised the pay scale of S.L.A. raising from 5910-20200+1900 grade pay & minimum initial pay of Rs. 7810/-.

That as explained in aforesaid paras action of the department/state arbitrary, discriminatory and there is violation of Article 14 & 16 of the Constitution of India. The department/state having accepted the recommendation but not implemented as regard to revised/upgraded pay scale similar to other categories of 10300-34800+grade pay 3200/- neither w.e.f. 01.06.2006 nor w.e.f. 01.12.2011 as indicated in para 5.63 of the recommendation of pay commission i.e. expert body that his undertaken the intricate exercise of evaluating the relevant parameters.

Name of the Post	Revised scale of pay w.e.f. 1.1.2006			Revised scale of pay w.e.f. 1.12.2011		
	Pay Band	Grade Pay	Initial Pay	Pay Band	Grade Pay	Initial Pay
Senior Laboratory Attendant	5910-20200	1900	7810	5910-20200	2400	9880
Library Restorer	5910-20200	1900	7810	5910-20200	2400	9880
Restorer	5910-20200	1900	7810	10300-34800	3200	13500
Clerk	5910-20200	1900	7810	10300-34800	3200	13500
Constable	5910-20200	1900	7810	10300-34800	3200	13500
Photostate Machine Operator	5910-20200	1900	7810	10300-34800	3200	13500

<b>Drivers of Heavy/Light/Commercial Vehicals and Staff Cars</b>	5910-20200	2000	8240	10300-34800	3200	13500
	After court decision CWP No. 7920 of 2013					

Name of the Post	Revised scale of pay w.e.f. 1.1.2006			Revised scale of pay w.e.f. 1.10.2011		
	Pay Band	Grade Pay	Initial Pay	Pay Band	Grade Pay	Initial Pay
Gram Sewak/Sewika	5910-20200	1900	7810	10300-34800	3200	13500

Name of the Post	Revised scale of pay w.e.f. 1.1.2006			Revised scale of pay w.e.f. 1.11.2011		
	Pay Band	Grade Pay	Initial Pay	Pay Band	Grade Pay	Initial Pay
Patwari	5910-20200	1900	7810	10300-34800	3200	13500

1. CWP No. 7920 of 2013 Manmohan Singh and others V/s State of Punjab and Others Decided on 01-02-2018 that the Drivers of Heavy/Light/Commercial Vehicals and Staff Cars are entitled to the revised pay scale of Rs. 10300-34800/- plus grade pay of Rs. 3200/- at least at par with patwaris with effect from 01.12.2011.

2. CWP No. 4456 of 2016 (O&M) Kanta Kumari and Others V/S State of Punjab and others ਦੇ ਫੈਸਲੇ 24-05-2018 ਅਤੇ COCP No. 161 of 2019 Kanta Kumari and others V/S Kartar Avtar Singh Chief Secretary and others ਦੇ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਪੰਜਾਬ ਸਰਕਾਰ ਆਮ ਰਾਜ ਪ੍ਰਬੰਧ ਵਿਭਾਗ (ਸਕੱਤਰੇਤ ਅਮਲਾ-5 ਸ਼ਾਖਾ) ਦੇ ਹੁਕਮ ਅਤੇ ਵਿੱਤ ਵਿਭਾਗ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਪੱਤਰ ਨੰ. 1/27/2019-5FPI/263-267 ਮਿੱਤੀ 12-02-2020 ਦੇ ਆਦੇਸ਼ਾਂ ਦੇ ਸਨਮੁੱਖ Restorer ਨੂੰ 10300-34800+3200 ਦਾ ਗਰੇਡ ਪੇ ਦੇਣ ਦੇ 01-12-2011 ਤੋਂ ਨੋਸ਼ਨਲ ਤੌਰ ਤੇ ਰਿਵਾਇਜ਼ਡ ਕਰਦੇ ਹੋਏ ਸਿਵਲ ਰਿੱਟ ਪਟੀਸ਼ਨ ਦਾਇਰ ਕਰਨ ਦੀ ਮਿੱਤੀ ਦੇ 38 ਮਹੀਨਿਆਂ ਤੱਕ ਦੇ ਬਣਦੇ ਬਕਾਏ ਦੇਣ ਦੇ ਆਰਡਰ 22-06-2020 ਨੂੰ ਕਰ ਦਿੱਤੇ ਹਨ ।

**ਉਪਰੋਕਤ ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ SLA / Library Restorer 10300-34800+3200 ਗਰੇਡ ਪੇ ਲੈਣ ਲਈ ਸੰਪਰਕ ਕਰਨ ਕਿਉਂਕਿ ਇਹ ਸਕੇਲ ਪੰਜਾਬ ਸਰਕਾਰ ਦੇ Restorers, Clerks, Constables, Photostate machine operators, Drivers, Gram Sewak/Sewika ਅਤੇ Patwaris ਲੈ ਰਹੇ ਹਨ । Restorer ਦੇ ਕੇਸ ਦੀ ਸੁਣਵਾਈ ਸਮੇਂ ਕੋਰਟ ਨੇ ਟਿਪਣੀ ਕੀਤੀ ਕਿ ਜੇਕਰ ਇਕ ਵਾਰ ਸਰਕਾਰ 2 ਅਹੁਦਿਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਬਰਾਬਰ ਮੰਨਦਿਆ ਸਮਾਨ ਤਨਖਾਹ ਦੇ ਰਹੀ ਸੀ ਤਾਂ ਅਜਿਹੇ ਵਿਚ ਹੁਣ ਕੰਮ ਦੀ ਪ੍ਰਕਿਰਤੀ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਅਲੱਗ-ਅਲੱਗ ਤਨਖਾਹ ਦੇਣ ਦੀ ਦਲੀਲ ਕਿੰਝ ਮੰਨੀ ਜਾ ਸਕਦੀ ਹੈ ?**

**Dr. Krishan Lal**

B.Sc., B.Ed., M.A., M.Com., Ph.D.  
Retd. Lecturer Political Sc.  
H. No. 181, Ward No. 3  
Bhagat Singh Marg, Near Naveen School,  
BUDHLADA -151502 Distt. Mansa (Punjab)

Website : www.krishanahelp.com  
Email : drkrishan365@gmail.com. info@krishanahelp.com  
M : Punjab 098157-13297 / 70090-22962 / 63  
084272-03297, 084272-03298  
Whats App No. 9815713297, 9915031482  
Office : 9041013814 -19 (6 Lines)  
Office Time: 10:00 am to 1:00 pm, 4:00pm to 7:00 pm

A consultancy firm to provide help for the problems of govt. employees & retired pensioners

**PERFORMA (ENGLISH CAPITAL LETTERS) Regarding SLA / Library Restorer Grade  
10300-34800+3200 from 01-12-2011**

Name & Father Name	
Designation	
School	
Date Of Birth	
Aadhar Card No.	
Date Of Appointment	
Date Of regular Joining	
Date of Joining as S.L.A. / Library Restorer	
Date Of Retirement	
Mobile Number & Whats App Number	
Email Address	
Residence Address & Distt	
Signature	

**Important Points:-**

1. In case of female, write the name of husband in address.
2. Send one copy of performa by whatsapp and one by post.
3. Send one copy of Aadhar Card by whatsapp and one by post.

Paytm Payment Mobile Number:- 9915031482  
Google Pay Payment Mobile Number:- 9915031482  
PhonePe Payment Mobile Number:- 9915031482

<b>State Bank of India Budhlada</b>
<b>Distt. Mansa(Punjab)</b>
<b>Current A/c No.39453963229</b>
<b>In Favour of: Krishana Consultancy</b>
<b>IFSC Code: SBIN0050050</b>
<b>Whatsapp No - 98157-13297</b>

# POWER OF ATTORNEY

In the Court of .....

..... [ Plaintiff/Appellant  
Complainant  
Petitioner

**VERSUS**

..... [ Defendant  
Respondent,  
Accused

**KNOW ALL** to whom these present shall come that I/We undersigned appoint

for the ..... in the above mentioned case to do all the following acts deeds and things or any of them that is to say :-

1. To act appear and plead in the above mentioned case in the court or any other Court in which the same may be tried or heard in the execution or in any stage of its progress until its final decision.
2. Present pleading appeals letter patent appeal cross objection or petitions for execution review, revisions withdrawal compromise or other petitions or affidavit or other documents as shall deemed necessary or advisable for the prosecution of the said case in all its stage.
3. To file and take back documents and to file application for restoration there of in case it is dismissed in default.
4. To withdraw or compromise the said case or submit for arbitration any difference or disputes that shall arise touching or in any manner relating to the said case.
5. To deposit draw any receive money and grant receipt there of and to do all other acts and things which may be necessary to be done for the progress and in the case of prosecutions of said case.
6. To employee and other legal practitioner authorising him to exercise the power and authorities hereby conferred on the advocate whenever he may think fit to do so.

And I/We hereby agree to ratify whatever the Advocate or his substitute shall do in the promises.

And I/We hereby agree not to hold the Advocate or his substitute responsible for the result of said for hearing case in consequence from the court when the said case is called up or for any negligence of the said Advocate or his substitute.

And I/We hereby agree that in the event of whole or any part of fee agreed by me to be paid to the Advocate, remaining unpaid he shall be entitled to withdraw from the prosecution of the said case until the same is paid if any costs are allowed for an adjournment the advocate would be entitled to the same.

**IN WITNESS WHERE OF** I/We agree to set my/our hands to the represent the contents of which have been explained to understand by me/us this the .....

.....day..... 20.....

(Signature or Thumb Impression of client)

Accepted :

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

(1) CWP No. 18466 of 2014 (O&M)  
Date of decision: April 26, 2017

Anuj Kumar Sharma and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondents

(2) CWP No. 8687 of 2015 (O&M)

Vinod Kumar and others

...Petitioners

Versus

The State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

(3) CWP No. 24372 of 2015 (O&M)

Sukhwinder Singh and others

...Petitioners

Versus

The State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR**

Present: Mr. Kanwal Goyal, Advocate,  
the petitioners in CWP No. 18466 of 2014.

Mr. Ranvir S. Chauhan, Advocate,  
for the petitioners in CWP Nos. 8687 and 24372 of 2015.

Mr. Pankaj Mulwani, DAG, Punjab.

**JAISHREE THAKUR, J.**

1. By this common order, this court proposes to decide CWP No.18466 of 2012 and CWP Nos. 8687 and 24372 of 2015, since a common

law point is involved. For the sake of brevity, facts are being taken from Civil Writ Petition No. 18466 of 2014 titled **Anuj Kumar Sharma and another Versus State of Punjab and others.**

2. In brief, the petitioners were initially appointed as Restorers and subsequently promoted to the post of Telephone Attendants in Punjab Civil Secretariat. The basic qualification required for appointment to the post of Restorers, Clerk, Photostat Machine Operator and Telephone Attendants/Operators in Punjab Civil Secretariat is the same namely, matriculation from a recognized University or its equivalent. In addition, candidates applying for the post is required to qualify the competitive tests to be held by the recruiting authority. The employees initially were placed in the same pay scale of ₹950–1800 which was subsequently revised to ₹3120–5160 w.e.f. 01.01.1996 and thereafter they were all granted the revised pay scale of ₹5910–20200 and grade pay of ₹1900 w.e.f. 01.01.2006. Thereafter, the pay scales of Clerks, Constables Photostat Machine Operators were again revised from ₹5910–20200 to ₹10300–34800 with grade pay of ₹3200 w.e.f. 01.12.2011. However, the pay scale of the Telephone Attendants and Operators was not revised and they were kept in the same pay band of ₹5910–20200 with a revision in the grade pay from ₹2400. Aggrieved against the denial of revision in pay scale as is given to others, the instant writ petition has been filed.

3. Mr. Kanwal Goel and Mr. Ranvir S. Chauhan, learned counsels appearing on behalf of the petitioners, contend that initially Photostat Machine Operators, Constables, Clerks and Telephone Attendants had all been given the same pay scale and it is only vide Punjab notification dated

15.12.2011 that the scale of pay of Telephone Attendants was kept at ₹5910–20200 with grade pay of ₹2400, while increasing it for others to ₹10300–34800 with grade pay of ₹3200 w.e.f. 01.12.2011, thereby creating a disparity in the pay scale. In this regard, a representation had been addressed to the authorities concerned to remove the anomaly that had arisen but no action was taken thereon. It is argued that as per Rule 7 of Punjab Civil Secretariat (State Service Class III) Rules 1976 (hereinafter called '**the Rules of 1976**'), the mode of appointment and minimum educational qualification to the post of Clerk is mentioned at serial No. 4 which is either by direct appointment, by transfer from another department or by promotion from amongst Restorers who would have the qualification of being a graduate from of a recognized University or its equivalent or being a matriculate with 5 years experience with as a Restorer along with having to qualify a Departmental test. As per Rule 7, at serial No. 5 a Restorer could be appointed by direct appointment, through transfer or by selection from amongst the Daftris of the Punjab Civil Secretariat and the qualification of the Daftri's is matriculation from a recognized University or its equivalent with 3 years experience in service as Daftri. Furthermore, at serial No. 19 Telephone Attendant is to be appointed only by way of promotion from amongst the restorers with educational qualification of Matriculate from a recognized university with the ability to handle telephone and being prompt in conveying messages on the telephone. It is further argued that in similar cases this Court in **Gurbir Singh and others Vs Punjab And Haryana High Court and others CWP No. 488 of 2015** and other connected writ petitions had allowed the revision of pay scales of

Restorers of this Court who had also raised a grievance regarding the anomaly in the pay scale. Once a person is promoted to a higher post his pay cannot be lower than the pay scale of the feeder post. Based on the aforesaid judgment, the petitioners herein claim removal of the anomaly that has crept in.

4. Per contra, Mr. Pankaj Mulwani, Deputy Advocate General Punjab, for the respondents, contend that the Cabinets Sub-Committee which was constituted to remove the individual grievances of the employees did not favour pay scale to the Telephone Operators equivalent to Clerks, Photostat Operators and Constables. It is further argued that grant of pay scale and determination of parity in pay scale is a complex matter which is for executive to discharge and not within the purview of the High Court. It is also argued that the nature of job of a Clerk is absolutely different than that of Telephone Operator/Attendant. Clerks have to attend matters pertaining to Courts, RTI Commission and other ancillary matters which is not the case as of Telephone Attendants and moreover now the minimum qualification for the post of Clerk has been enhanced from matriculation to graduation by day notification dated 10.2.2009 with experience on computers and, therefore, the claim of the petitioners cannot be exceeded to. In this regard, learned counsel places reliance upon a judgment rendered in **S.C Chandra Versus State Of Jharkhand, reported in (2007) 8 SCC 219** and **Union Of India Versus Hiramoney Sein and others (2008) 1 SCC 630.**

5. I have heard the counsel for the parties and with their assistance have gone through the pleadings.



6. A contention has been raised that this Court does not have the jurisdiction to entertain the matter by relying upon judgments rendered in **S.C Chandra and Hiramoney Sein** (supra). A perusal of the judgments would show that they are distinguishable and not applicable with the instant matter since they pertain to equal pay for equal work, which is not the case in hand.

7. It has been held in the case of **Randhir Singh & others vs. Union of India, AIR 1982 SC 879**, that the equation of posts and payment are the matters to be decided by expert bodies, like the Pay Commission. In **Union of India vs. Tarit Ranjan Das, (2003) 11 SCC 658** and **Union of India and another vs. P. V. Hariharan and another, (1997) 3 SCC 568**, a similar view has been expressed, wherein, it has been held that the fixation of pay scale is a function of the Government and once an expert body has gone into the issue, it is not open for any Court to sit in judgment as on appeal over the conclusion arrived at.

8. In the case in hand, learned counsel for the respondents is not in a position to dispute that till 15.12.2011 the pay scale of Constables, Clerks, Photostat Machine Operators and Telephone Attendants was the same, that is in the scale of ₹5910–20200. In **Gurbir Singh's** case (supra), the Restorers of this Court filed a writ petition seeking restoration of equation in pay scale between Restorers and Clerks, which writ petition came to be allowed by issuing a direction to restore the status quo ante as on 01.01.2006 where the Restorers and Clerks were in the same pay band and grade pay. These orders came to be passed by the Single Bench of this Court by taking note that the Hon'ble Committee of this court had recommended

the removal of the anomaly which stood approved by the Hon'ble the Chief Justice in exercise of powers vested in him under Article 229 of the Constitution of India. Therefore, by virtue of judgment rendered in **Gurbirs Singh's** case Restorers have been held to be entitled to a pay band of ₹10300-34800 with grade pay of ₹3200/-. The Telephone Attendants being a promotional post would also in all probability be entitled to similar scale if not an enhanced one.

9. The Finance Department by Instructions dated 23.05.2012 has issued a direction that '*only those proposals for revision of pay scale of employees is to be submitted to finance Department in which the anomaly has arisen as a consequence of re-revision of pay scale of a post on the recommendations of the Cabinet Sub-Committee whereby the pay scale of promotional post has become lower than the pay scale of the feeder post*'. The instant case is a fit case to be placed before the Finance Department or before the Pay Anomaly Committee for consideration of removal of the pay anomaly that has been created. The petitioners herein are Telephone Attendants who were in the same pay scale as Clerks, Constables, Photostat Machine Operators etc. A post of a Clerk can be filled up by promotion from Restorers who has the necessary qualification and at serial No. 19 the only source of recruitment to the post of Telephones Attendant is by promotion from the post of Restorers. Therefore, a person being promoted to a higher post cannot under any circumstances be in a lower pay scale.

10. In view of the above situation, where an anomaly has arisen in the pay scale of the petitioners being higher in post than the Restorers, while getting a lower pay scale, it is directed that this matter be placed before the

Finance Department in view of their own Instructions dated 23.05.2012 for consideration of removal of pay anomaly of the petitioners herein while keeping the judgment rendered in **Gurbir Singh's** case (supra) in mind where Restorers pay scale has been brought on par with Clerks.

11. Let this matter be considered by the Finance Department/or the Pay Anomaly Committee in its true perspective within a period of four months on receipt of a certified copy of this order. Needless to say in case the claim of the petitioners is being rejected, a speaking order be passed in this regard, which the petitioners would be at liberty to challenge. In case claim of the petitioners has merit, the monetary benefits including difference of arrears of pay accruing there from be calculated and paid to the petitioners within 2 months thereafter.

12. The writ petitions stand disposed of with the aforesaid directions.

**April 26, 2017**  
prem

**(JAISHREE THAKUR)**  
**JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned  
Whether reportable

Yes  
No

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

(I) CWP-4456-2016 (O&M)  
Date of decision : 24.05.2018

Kanta Kumari and others

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondent(s)

(II) CWP-4781-2016 (O&M)  
Date of decision : 24.05.2018

Anita Sharma and another

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondent(s)

(III) CWP-6354-2016 (O&M)  
Date of decision : 24.05.2018

Balwinder Singh and others

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondent(s)

(IV) CWP-6361-2016 (O&M)  
Date of decision : 24.05.2018

Netar Singh and others

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondent(s)

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN**

Present: Mr. R.K. Arya, Advocate,  
for the petitioner(s).

Ms. Sudeepti Sharma, Addl.A.G., Punjab.

**JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J.**

The present batch of four petitions is being disposed of by this single judgment as the controversy involved therein is common. However, for brevity, the facts are being derived from CWP-4456-2016.

On 03.11.2017, the following order was passed:-

*“Learned counsel representing the petitioners would contend that the controversy raised in the instant petition would be covered in terms of directions issued by a Coordinate Bench in **CWP-18466-2014** decided on 26.04.2017 (**Anuj Kumar Sharma & another Vs. State of Punjab**) and other connected petitions.*

*In the case of **Anuj Kumar Sharma (supra)**, the matter has been referred to the Finance Department/The Pay Anomaly Committee to look into the grievance as regards dis-parity in the pay scales that were granted.*

*A copy of the judgment in **Anuj Kumar Sharma's case (supra)** has been furnished to learned State counsel and who would complete instructions as to whether the same course of action can be adopted even in the present writ petition.*

*List on 18.12.2017.*

*A photocopy of this order be placed on the connected files of this case.”*

Learned State counsel has conceded that the case of the petitioners would be covered in terms of directions issued in **Anuj Kumar**

**Sharma's case (supra)**, the operative portion of which reads thus:-

“9. The Finance Department by Instructions dated 23.05.2012 has issued a direction that 'only those proposals for revision of pay scale of employees is to be submitted to finance Department in which the anomaly has arisen as a consequence of re-revision of pay scale of a post on the recommendations of the Cabinet Sub-Committee whereby the pay scale of promotional post has become lower than the pay scale of the feeder post'. The instant case is a fit case to be placed before the Finance Department or before the Pay Anomaly Committee for consideration of removal of the pay anomaly that has been created. The petitioners herein are Telephone Attendants who were in the same pay scale as Clerks, Constables, Photostat Machine Operators etc. A post of a Clerk can be filled up by promotion from Restorers who has the necessary qualification and at serial No.19 the only source of recruitment to the post of Telephones Attendant is by promotion from the post of Restorers. Therefore, a person being promoted to a higher post cannot under any circumstances be in a lower pay scale.

10. In view of the above situation, where an anomaly has arisen in the pay scale of the petitioners being higher in post than the Restorers, while getting a lower pay scale, it is directed that this matter be placed before the Finance Department in view of this own Instructions dated 23.05.2012 for consideration of removal of pay anomaly of the petitioners herein while keeping the judgment rendered in **Gurbir Singh's** case (supra) in mind where Restorers pay scale has been brought on par with Clerks.

11. Let his matter be considered by the Finance

*Department/or the Pay Anomaly Committee in its true perspective within a period of four months on receipt of a certified copy of this order. Needless to say in case the claim of the petitioners is being rejected, a speaking order be passed in this regard, which the petitioners would be at liberty to challenge. In case claim of the petitioners has merit, the monetary benefits including difference of arrears of pay accruing there from be calculated and paid to the petitioners within 2 months thereafter.”*

In view of the stand taken by the parties and the directions given in Anuj Kumar Sharma's case (supra), the instant writ petition is disposed of in the same terms.

**24.05.2018**  
*atulsethi*

**(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)**  
**JUDGE**

Whether speaking / reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No

**103(1) COCP-99-2019(O&M)**

NETAR SINGH AND ORS VS KARAN AVTAR SINGH, CHIEF SECRETARY AND ANR

**103(2) COCP-100-2019 (O&M)**

BALWINDER SINGH AND OTHERS. VS. KARAN AVTAR SINGH, CHIEF SECRETARY AND ANOTHER

**103(3) COCP-101-2019 (O&M)**

ANITA SHARMA AND ANOTHER VS. KARAN AVTAR SINGH, CHIEF SECRETARY AND ANOTHER

**103(4) COCP-161-2019 (O&M)**

KANTA KUMARI AND OTHERS VS. KARAN AVTAR SINGH, CHIEF SECRETARY AND ANOTHER

Present: Mr. R.K. Arya, Advocate  
for the petitioner (s).

\*\*\*\*\*

Learned State counsel submits that order dated 24.05.2018 passed in CWP-4456-2016 and connected matters, has been complied with, as such, all the petitions captioned above, have been rendered infructuous.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that vide order dated 11.02.2020 (Annexure R-1), the respondents claimed to have removed the pay anomaly and revised the grade pay. However, the claims of the petitioners have not been fully met to which they will avail separate legal remedies available to them. He further submits that consequential monetary benefits on revision of the pay scale have not been paid till date and the arrears have also been restricted to 38 months despite the fact that there is no such direction in the order dated 26.04.2017 passed in CWP-18466-2014.

Learned State counsel submits that the arrears of petitioners are being worked out and will be paid within 8 weeks.

Affidavit be also filed clarifying as to under what circumstances, arrears have been restricted to 38 months while complying with order dated 24.05.2018 (ibid).

List on 06.07.2020.

Against the order passed by the respondents revising their pay scales, the petitioners may avail separate legal remedies available to them.

Copy of this order be placed on the files of other connected matters.

( SURINDER GUPTA )  
JUDGE

**March 05, 2020**  
*Sachin M.*



218 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH

CWP No.7920 of 2013.

Date of Decision: 01.02.2018.

Manmohan Singh and others

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

**CORAM :** Hon'ble Mr. Justice Jitendra Chauhan

**Present :** Mr. K.S. Dadwal, Advocate,  
for the petitioners.

Ms. Sudeepti Sharma, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

**JITENDRA CHAUHAN.J.**

This petition has been filed under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to remove the anomaly operating in the pay scales of the petitioners and to grant the pay scale of Rs.10,300-34,800/- plus grade pay of Rs.32,00/-.

It is contended that the petitioners have been working as drivers in various departments under the control of State of Punjab and are performing arduous nature of duties. Initially, the pay scale of the petitioners was higher to the Patwaris and Clerks and in the successive pay revisions, the petitioners were kept at higher pedestal than the Patwaris and Clerks. However, in the pay revision implemented with effect from 01.12.2011, the pay scale of the petitioners was not revised.

In the reply filed on behalf of respondent Nos. 1, 2 and 6, it has been pleaded that the petitioners are in the Health department are not at par with the Clerks of other departments. The qualification, nature of duties and responsibilities, promotional channel and facilities of the petitioners vis-a-vis Clerks and Patwaris are quite distinct. As per the notification dated 10.02.2009 Annexure R-1, the qualifications for the post of Clerks had been changed whereas, the qualifications for the post of Driver remained unchanged. The petitioners are not only paid extra amount in view of overtime duties but also they are given uniform and special pay. Besides the service rules, even the nature of duties of these posts are different. There is no parity in these posts and consequently, there is no anomaly in the pay scales of the petitioners with that of Clerks or Patwaris.

Heard.

To understand the alleged discrimination, it is apposite to tabulate the successive pay commission reports respecting Drivers of Heavy/Light/Commercial Vehicles and Staff Cars (petitioners) and Patwaris:-

Category	01/01/68	01/01/78	01/01/86	01/01/96	01/01/06	01/10/11	01/12/11
Drivers of Heavy/Light/Commercial Vehicles and staff cars		400-600	950-2100+300	3330-6200	6910-20200+ GP: 2000	--	
Patwari	110-180	400-600	950-1800	3120-5160	5910-20200+ GP 1900		10300-34800 G.P. 3200

A bare perusal of the afore-stated chart reveals that the drivers were initially drawing pay scale of 400-600 in the year 1978 and in the year 1986 their pay scale was at a higher pedestal than the Patwaris. Similar was the position in the year 1996 as also in 2006. However, the recommendations made by the Pay Commission in 2011 brought about anomaly in the pay scales to be granted to the drivers. Intriguingly, Patwaris, who were drawing lower pay scale were granted pay scale of Rs.10,300-34,800/- plus grade pay of Rs.32,00/- as against the drivers (petitioners) who were not granted the revised pay scale in 2011. This anomaly has to be redressed. Admittedly, the petitioners being drivers are performing arduous duties but have been drawing lesser pay than the Patwaris. The changed pay scales adverse to the petitioners are not justifiable in the background explained above. They are legally entitled for the pay scale of Rs.10,300-34,800/- plus grade pay of Rs.32,00/- as is being drawn by the Patwaris. The State being a model employer cannot act arbitrarily and in a discriminatory manner to the prejudice of one class of its employees. From the inception till date, the nature of job has substantially remained unchanged. This fact itself is suggestive of the fact that the deviation in the original pattern of pay scale is not substantiated by any logic nor any material in support of the fact that both the cadres have undergone any change has been brought on record by the State. Therefore, it is inherently illogical to discriminate against one set of employees of the State as against their counterparts who were at the same footing at the time of inception of

the process.

In **K.T. Veerappa and others vs. State of Karnataka and others (2006) 9 SCC 406** it was held as under:-

*“13. He next contended that fixation of pay and parity in duties is the function of the Executive and financial capacity of the Government and the priority given to different types of posts under the prevailing policies of the Government are also relevant factors. In support of this contention, he has placed reliance in the case of State of Haryana and another vs. Haryana Civil Secretariat Personal Staff Association, 2002(3) SCT 674 and Union of India and another vs. S.B. Vohra and others, 2004(1) SCT 788. There is no dispute nor can there be any to the principle as settled in the case of State of Haryana & Anr. v. Haryana Civil Secretariat Personal Staff Association (supra) that fixation of pay and determination of parity in duties is the function of the Executive and the scope of judicial review of administrative decision in this regard is very limited. However, it is also equally well-settled that the courts should interfere with administrative decisions pertaining to pay fixation and pay parity when they find such a decision to be unreasonable, unjust and prejudicial to a section of employees and taken in ignorance of material and relevant factors.”*

Further in **G.K. Nagpal vs. Punjab State Electricity Board 1998(1) SCT 694** it was held as under:-

*“5. It is undoubtedly true that the posts of Laboratory Assistants are different from those of Line Superintendents etc. It is also correct that they carry different qualifications as well as different duties. However, the fact remains that all these posts had been treated as 'equal' initially. They were even treated as 'equal' even at the time of the revision of the pay scales. If at a subsequent stage they were to be treated differently, some reason should have been disclosed. The respondent-Board has not disclosed any reason in the written*

*statement. This is in spite of the fact that various officers of the Board have repeatedly opined that the duties of the posts are analogous, the qualifications are similar and as such the plea for parity of treatment in the pay-scales should have been granted. Why the respondent-Board treated the appellants differently ? Neither in the written statement nor by any other document the reason has been disclosed in the Court. Even at the hearing, no one has appeared on behalf of the respondent-Board to justify this action.*

*6. We are conscious of the fact that a differential treatment in the matter of pay scales on the basis of educational qualifications and the nature of duties is permissible. However, it is equally clear to us that if two categories of employees are treated as equal initially, they should continue to be so treated unless a differential treatment is justified by some cogent reason. In a case where the nature of duties is drastically altered, a differential scale of pay may be justified. Similarly, if a higher qualification is prescribed for a particular post, a higher scale of pay may be granted. However, if the basic qualifications and the job requirements continue to be identical or as they were initially laid down, then the Court shall be slow to accept the action of the authority in according a differential treatment unless some good reason is disclosed. In the present case, the only reason pointed out in the written statement is based on the qualifications and the job requirements. There has been admittedly no change in either of the two parameters. That being so, no new ground for creating a classification was made out.*

*7. In view of the above, we allow the appeal. The appellants shall be entitled to be placed in the scale of Rs. 700-1200 with effect from January 1, 1978. We are not awarding any costs as no one has appeared on behalf of the respondent-Board to contest the claim.*

*Appeal allowed.”*


**The upshot of the above discussion leads to the**

conclusion that the anomaly deserved to be removed and the present writ petition succeeds. The petitioners are held entitled to the revised pay scale of Rs.10,300-34,800/- plus grade pay of Rs.32,00/- though, not at a higher pay scale but at least at par with the Patwaris with effect from 01.12.2011. The State is directed to fix the pay of the petitioners accordingly within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this judgment. The arrears of the pay etc. be also released in their favour within three months thereafter.

01.02.2018.  
SN

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)  
JUDGE

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

 <b>High Court of Punjab and Haryana</b> Chandigarh			
<a href="#">Check Status at Supreme Court</a>		<a href="#">Check Status Of Original Case CWP-6361-2016</a>	
Case Details For Case COCP-99-2019			
Diary Number	2204749	District	UT-CHANDIGARH
Category	34-CIVIL CONTEMPTS	Main Case Detail	--
Party Detail	NETAR SINGH AND ORS V/S KARAN AVTAR SINGH, CHIEF SECRETARY AND ANR		
Advocate Name	R.K.ARYA (P-528-2002)	List Type	URGENT
Status	PENDING	Next date	23-FEB-2021
Related Cases/Miscellaneous Applications			
<a href="#">CM-365-CIL-2019</a>	IN COCP-99-2019		
<a href="#">CM-366-CIL-2019</a>	IN COCP-100-2019		
<a href="#">CM-367-CIL-2019</a>	IN COCP-101-2019		
<a href="#">CM-649-CIL-2019</a>	IN COCP-161-2019		
<a href="#">CM-7454-CIL-2020</a>	IN COCP-1375-2020		
<a href="#">CM-8475-CIL-2020</a>	IN COCP-1375-2020		
<a href="#">COCP-100-2019</a> <a href="#">View Order Dated 05-04-2019</a>	WITH COCP-99-2019		
<a href="#">COCP-101-2019</a> <a href="#">View Order Dated 05-04-2019</a>	WITH COCP-99-2019		
<a href="#">COCP-1375-2020</a> <a href="#">View Order Dated 23-07-2020</a>	WITH COCP-99-2019		
<a href="#">COCP-161-2019</a> <a href="#">View Order Dated 15-01-2019</a>	WITH COCP-101-2019		
Case Listing Details			
Cause List Date	List Type :Sr. No.	Bench	
05-MAR-2020	URGENT:103	HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURINDER GUPTA	
17-FEB-2020	ORDINARY:284	HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH	
22-OCT-2019	ORDINARY:320	HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN	
22-JUL-2019	URGENT:110	HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN	
05-APR-2019	ORDINARY:260	HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NIRMALJIT KAUR	
21-FEB-2019	ORDINARY:256	HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NIRMALJIT KAUR	
11-JAN-2019	URGENT:131	HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NIRMALJIT KAUR	
Judgment Details For Case: COCP-99-2019			
Party Detail: NETAR SINGH AND ORS V/S KARAN AVTAR SINGH, CHIEF SECRETARY AND ANR			
Order Date	Order and Case-ID	Bench	Judgment Link
05-MAR-20	Interim Order in COCP-99-2019	HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURINDER GUPTA	<a href="#">View Order</a>
17-FEB-20	Interim Order in COCP-99-2019	HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH	<a href="#">View Order</a>
22-OCT-19	Interim Order in COCP-99-2019	HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN	<a href="#">View Order</a>
22-JUL-19	Interim Order in COCP-99-2019	HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN	<a href="#">View Order</a>
05-APR-19	Interim Order in COCP-99-2019	HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NIRMALJIT KAUR	<a href="#">View Order</a>
11-JAN-19	Interim Order in COCP-99-2019	HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NIRMALJIT KAUR	<a href="#">View Order</a>
Designed and Developed by National Informatics Centre			<a href="#">Disclaimer</a>
Contents Published and Managed by Punjab & Haryana High Court , Chandigarh.			

409

I-2  
5

5

4

**Shashi Bhushan Nagpal**  
B.A. (Hons.) LL.B.L.S.G.D.  
Ex-Treasury Officer  
Advocate  
Punjab & Haryana High Court

Office-cum-Residence:  
H.No. 414/1 Sector 43-A  
Chandigarh  
Mob.: 988868640  
Regd. Letter  
Dated: 14.08.2014

To

1. The Principal Secretary  
Deptt. of Education, Govt. of Punjab  
Punjab Civil Secretariat, Chandigarh
2. The Secretary  
Deptt. of Personal Finance, Govt. of Punjab  
Punjab Civil Secretariat, Chandigarh
3. The Director of Public Instructions (SE), Punjab  
Punjab School Board Complex,  
Phase IX SAS Nagar, Mohali

**Subject:** Legal Justice Demand Notice seeking restoration of equality of post of Senior Lab Attendant with Photostat Machine Operators/Clerks, Constables and Gram Sevekas granted by the 5<sup>th</sup> Punjab Pay Commission continuously since long also with the posts Bill, Ledger Keepers & Store Keepers but Govt. of Punjab disturbed equality by not upgrading pay scale equal to them i.e. 10300-34800 + grade pay 3200 minimum initial pay Rs. 13150 w.e.f 01.12.2011 whereas SLA has been allowed to be placed in the pay scale 5910-20200+2400 grade pay as on 01.01.2006 being similar situated being treated in a discriminate manner.

Sir,

I on behalf of my client Om Parkash S/o Hari Chand who is working on the post of Senior Lab Attendant in Govt. Senior Secondary School Chak Sherwala Tehsil & District Muktsar Sahib alongwith his many colleagues whose particulars are given below:-

1. Vijay Kumar S/o Gurdoyal Singh SLA, Govt. Senior Secondary School Boys Muktsar Sahib.
2. Gurjeevan Singh S/o Gurcharan Singh SLA, Govt. Senior Secondary School Boys Muktsar Sahib.
3. Arjit Pal Kaur W/o Balwinder Singh SLA, Govt. Senior Secondary School Boys Muktsar Sahib.
4. Karamjit Kaur W/o Amandeep Singh Govt. Senior Secondary School Boys Muktsar Sahib.
5. Satnam Singh S/o Hardev Singh Govt. Senior Secondary School Girls Muktsar Sahib.
6. Kulbir Singh S/o Geetan Singh, Govt. Senior Secondary School Girls Muktsar Sahib.



7. Nirmala Devi W/o Subhash Chander, Govt. Senior Secondary School Girls Muktsar Sahib.
8. Gurveer Kaur D/o Gurbinder Singh, Govt. Senior Secondary School Girls Muktsar Sahib.
9. Gurmeet Singh S/o Balwant Singh, Govt. Senior Secondary School Doda Distt. Muktsar Sahib.
10. Kuldeep Singh S/o Harbans Singh, Govt. Senior Secondary School Doda Distt. Muktsar Sahib.
11. Gurtej Singh S/o Jagir Singh, Govt. Senior Secondary School Bhalaiana (Muktsar).
12. Gurpartap Singh S/o Jarnej Singh, Govt. High School Bhagjari Distt. Muktsar.
13. Gurjeet Kaur W/o Amandeep Singh, Govt. Senior Secondary School, Girls Bhagrar Distt. Muktsar Sahib.
14. Kabir Singh S/o Mall Singh, Govt. Senior Secondary School, Boys Bhagrar Distt. Muktsar Sahib.
15. Harmandeep Singh S/o Nirbhey Singh, Govt. Senior Secondary School Girls Malcut Distt. Muktsar Sahib.
16. Navjoot Bala W/o Balwinder Kumar, Govt. Senior Secondary School Girls Malout Distt. Muktsar Sahib.
17. Rajbir Singh S/o Harjeet Singh Govt. Senior Secondary School Lambi Distt. Muktsar Sahib.
18. Daljit Singh S/o Harbans Singh, Govt. Senior Secondary School, Udhekaran (Muktsar Sahib).
19. Gursevak Singh S/c Ravinder Singh, Govt. Senior Secondary School Udhekaran (Muktsar Sahib).
20. Sukhjinder Singh S/o Jagjit Singh, Govt. High School Sarai Nagar (Muktsar Sahib)
21. Jaspal Kaur D/o Partap Singh, Govt. Senior Secondary Mandi Harzi Ram Malout Distt. Muktsar Sahib.
22. Jagmohan Singh S/o Darshan Singh Govt. Senior Secondary School Bariwala, Distt. Muktsar Sahib.
23. Surinder Kaur W/o Balwinder Singh, Govt. Senior Secondary School, Badal Distt. Muktsar Sahib.
24. Paras Ram S/o Hans Raj, Govt. Senior Secondary School, Badal Distt. Muktsar.

serve upon you this legal justice demand notice as under:-

2. That it is on the record of the Department/Govt. that my clients are performing duties of Senior Lab Attendant, which are supervisory and are of responsibilities in nature and initial basic qualification for recruitment is matriculation with Science. Consequently since 1978 they were placed in the pay scale of 400-600 equivalent to the pay scale admissible to the clerk who have qualification of Matriculation then.

4	Patwari	-do-
5	Gram Sewak/Seweka	-do-

7. That 5<sup>th</sup> pay commission in para 5.63 while considering the demands of the education employees in this sector has made as following recommendation:-

5.63 Laboratory staff in schools be given higher pay scale in view of the significance of their assignment.

8. That it is also on record of this department wherein departmental authorities admitted anomaly in the cadre of Senior Lab Attendant hence once respondents have found the anomaly they are entitled to be replaced at par with other persons as mentioned in this legal justice demand notice. The cadre of Senior Lab Attendant should also granted the same scale of pay as these were admitting equated posts as on 01.01.2006 hence cadre of SLA is also entitled to the pay scale of 10300-34800+grade pay 3600 w.e.f 01.01.2006.

9. That respondent Govt. of Punjab having accepted recommendation that Laboratory staff should have been given higher pay scale of 10300-34800+grade pay Rs. 3600 minimum pay of Rs. 13500/- instead of revised the pay scale of the following categories raising from 5610-20200+1900 grade pay & minimum initial pay of Rs. 7810/-

'B'

1	Earth Work Munshi	5910-20200 + grade pay 2400 initial pay 9880
2	Work Minstry	-do-
3	Work Munshi	-do-
4	Work Inspector	-do-
5	Conductor	-do-
6	Restorer	-do-
7	Multi Instructor	-do-
8	Laboratory Assistant/Attendant	-do-
9	Milk Recorders	-do-
10	Pump Operator	-do-
11	Insect Collector	-do-

10. That it is admitted fact that it is the function of the executive to recommend the pay scale for different categories of its staff before the pay commission. Keeping in view the nature of their duties, qualification and various other factors and for that purpose expert bodies like pay commission given their recommendation in favour of SLA's. But in the present case as explained above, allowing higher pay denying the similar/equal situated person/employees will be case of re-writing the recommendation made by the pay commission. There is whole scale dissimilarity between the same post. Hence it is a case of discriminate/anomalies created by the Government.

11. That as per recommendation of earlier and now as per original recommendation of 5<sup>th</sup> Puniab Pay Commission. It was found merits in the contention of the holder of the posts of SLA and placed them at part with others categories of category 'A' w.e.f 01.01.2006 whereas Govt. of Punjab arbitrarily violated equation and crated anomaly in pay scale in a whimsical manner w.e.f 01.11.2011/01.12.2011. In this

manner employee of 'B' category's pay scale has been lowered down at their back without providing them an opportunity to defend their lower down pay scale violating principle of natural justice. Consequently respondent state violated provision of Article 14 & 16 of the Constitution of India by not restoring equal right of equal treatment by way of providing equal pay for equal work by not enhancing pay scale of 'B' category by withholding of their placement in the pay scale of Rs. 10300-34800+grade pay of Rs. 3200 with initial basic pay of Rs. 13500.

12. That non-upgradation of pay scale of the Senior Lab Attendant similar to Photostat Machine Operator, Bill Clerk, Ledger Keeper and Clerks indicate that departmental authorities are not initiated revision of pay case of SLA before the Anomaly committee being similar situated in an unconcerned manner consequently they contributed to bring in-efficiency not only this departmental authorities.

13. That Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in the full bench judgment of CWP 12029 of 1998 titled Rajbir Singh & others Vs. H.S.E.B. & others in Para 9 of the judgment held that in case of an anomaly has arisen during the revision of pay scale the correction thereof will be effective from the date when the anomaly had arisen in the present anomaly commenced from 01.12.2011 hence it is to be corrected from that date when anomaly was created/discovered.

14. That this Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP 5162 of 1993 titled Gauge Readers Association Vs. State of Haryana & others held that since telephone operators were placed in the same pay scale upto 1979 and no action has been brought on record to remove discrimination between their pay scale and anomaly of different categories is also admitted. Although it is the duty of the employer to decide the pay scale of its employees. Hence it is found that disparity in the pay scale constitute discrimination and violation of Article 14/16 of the Constitution of India. In view of the above circumstance petition was allowed and petitioners were held entitled to the benefits of pay scale from the date disparity has been introduced.

15. That it is on record that 23.11.2011 Govt. of Punjab revised pay scale of the various cadres amended earlier notification dated 27.05.2009 having been placed them in the pay scale of 5910-20200+1900 grade pay. As per settled principle of law as settled by this Hon'ble High Court in the judgment of CWP 5209 of 2009 titled Kapil Dev Vs. Union of India 2010(2) SCT 213 wherein it is held that once anomaly in pay scale found to be removed the same can be removed by implementation of recommendation of pay commission in others cases also. In the absence of any explanation of non-removal of anomaly in the cadre of SLA they are entitled to revised pay. Hence petitioner was held entitled to similar benefits.

16. That claim of my client is further enlarging the anomaly by granting pay scale of 10300-34800+grade pay 3200 to clerk and other similar categories as explained in para 5 & 6. The Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP 10068 of 2012 titled Shubh Karan & others Vs. State of Punjab & others and in CWP 10554 of

2013 titled Darshan Singh & others Vs. State of Punjab directed the respondents to decide the base of implementation of anomaly within specified period.

17. That Delhi High Court in the case of Ram Kishan Dass & others Vs. Banwan Lal Suri & others 2006(89) DRJ 730 held and relevant portion of judgments are reproduced as under:-

'Another facts of statutory duty is to impose negative obligation on the state not to encroach upon the rights of the individual or to frustrate what is granted under the law. the legality or illegality of a state action particularly when they are acting in furtherance to the statutory powers vested in them, would be subject to judicial review not in its narrow sense whenever a cause is relatable to branch of statutory duty of a public officer the rule of law would essential provide for a remedy even if it is not so specifically provided for a remedy even if it is not so specifically spelled out in the provision of the Act, arbitrariness and unreasonableness being facts of Article 14 are available as ground not only for questioning an administrative action but even in certain cases even may invalidate sub-ordinate legislation. Timely action in the essence of Govt. functioning and unreasonable delay question the very correctness of such orders. It is settled law that *lex nil frustra jubet*.

18. That respondent state in the written statement of CWP 4948 of 2012 titled Satbir Singh & others Vs. State of Punjab that General Conversion table was implemented vide Govt. notification dated 27.05.2009 w.e.f 01.01.2006 from all Govt. employee. It is further submitted that pay commission had recommended upgraded scale of pay for certain categories of employees which were over and above the scale contained in the general conversion table. The recommendation of commission were accepted at a subsequent stage in the light of circular dated 05.10.2011 and made upgraded scale of pay admissible due to tight financial position on a prospective basis w.e.f. 01.10.2011. Consequently state Govt. implemented the recommendation of pay commission w.e.f 01.01.2006 qua certain category of employee and from a subsequent date different set of employees but in the case of cadre of Senior Lab Attendants recommendation of para 5.63 as reproduced in para 7 of this notice still remained unimplemented.

19. That in para 14 of judgment of CWP 4948/2012 this Hon'ble High Court also recorded that under para 5.64 the employees of Education Department were also recommended for higher pay scale. The Hon'ble High Court also recorded it is observation that it would be pertinent to note at this stage that the recommendation of higher pay scales/upgraded pay scale as specially noticed here in above were over and above the pay scale in the General Conversion/Fitment Table furnished in chapter 4 of the Pay Commission Report and in para 15 of the Judgment State Government taken a

categories stand the recommendation as regards to upgraded scale over and above the general conversion/fitment table contained in chapter 5 of the report has been accepted and implemented but w.e.f 01.10.2011 in the light of circular dated 05.10.2011. as explained recommendation of 5.63 relates to the cadre of Senior Lab Attendant has not been upgraded/higher revised pay scale as recommended by the Commission over & above the revised pay scale has not been given to continue arbitrariness & discrimination.

20. That as explained in aforesaid paras action of the department/state arbitrary, discriminatory and there is violation of Article 14 & 16 of the Constitution of India. The department/state having accepted the recommendation but not implemented as regard to revised/upgraded pay scale similar to other categories of 10300 - 34800+grade pay 3600/- neither w.e.f 01.06.2006 nor w.e.f 01.12.2011 as indicated in para 5.63 of the recommendation of pay commission i.e. expert body that has undertaken the intricate exercise of evaluating the relevant parameters.

21. That in the judgment of Division Bench of Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in the Punjab State Cooperative Agriculture Development Bank Ltd. Vs. Punjab State Cooperative Agriculture Development Bank Pensioners Association & others 2006(3) SCT 603 held that once it is found that anomaly had arisen, it has to be removed from the date thereof. The similarly view has been expressed by the full bench of the High Court in Rajbir Singh & others Vs. HSEB & others 2009(3) SCT 543 creation of anomaly has arisen, the mistake has to be remedied in such a manner that the aggrieved party does not have any adverse effect the mistake/anomaly. This work be possible if an anomaly in pay scale is corrected retrospectively with effect from the date when the anomalous pay scale was introduced. On the other hand if the mistake/anomaly is corrected from a future date, the concerned individual will have to suffer the effect of the anomaly from the date it had arisen till the date it was remedied.

Therefore, in the given facts and before filing a writ petition in the Hon'ble High Court. I through this legal justice demand notice seek fairness in action in a judicious process. You are therefore requested to initiate the action for revision of pay scale of the SLA and all other categories by up-gradating the pay scale of 10300-34800+grade pay of Rs. 3200 with minimum of pay 13500/- w.e.f 01.12.2011 within period of one month from today otherwise after lapse of this period I have instructed to approach the Court of law.

A copy of this legal justice demand notice has been retained by me to be used in future.

Chandigarh

S.B. Nagpal  
Advocate  
Counsel for the petitioner

SLA/Library Restorer <sup>I-2</sup> 5 (4)  
 grade equal to class  
 409

ਇਸ ਫੈਸਲੇ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ SLA, ਲਾਇਬ੍ਰੇਰੀ ਰਿਸਟੋਰਰਾਂ ਅਤੇ Junior Technician ਦਾ Pay Band 5910-20200 ਅਤੇ Grade Pay 2400 ਦੀ ਥਾਂ ਤੇ Pay Band 10300-34800 ਅਤੇ Grade Pay 3200 ਹੋ ਸਕਦਾ ਹੈ । ਜਿਸ ਨਾਲ ਮੁਢਲੀ Pay 9880 ਰੁਪਏ ਦੀ ਥਾਂ 13500 ਰੁਪਏ ਹੋ ਸਕਦੀ ਹੈ । ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਸੁਪਰਵਾਈਜਰ Junior Assistant ਦੇ ਬਰਾਬਰ Pay Band 10300-34800 ਅਤੇ Grade Pay 3600 ਲੈ ਸਕਦੇ ਹਨ ।

# ਆਪਣੇ ਰਵੱਈਏ, ਮੁੱਖ ਜੱਜ ਦੇ ਗਿਆਨ ਤੇ ਅਧਿਕਾਰ ਨੂੰ ਚੁਣੌਤੀ ਨਾ ਦੇਵੇ ਸਰਕਾਰ : ਹਾਈਕੋਰਟ

ਚੇਨਈ, 21 ਸਨਵਰੀ (ਵਿਕੇਕ)- ਪੰਜਾਬ ਸਰਕਾਰ ਵਲੋਂ 2011 ਵਿਚ ਜਾਰੀ ਨੋਟੀਫਿਕੇਸ਼ਨ ਦੇ ਚਲਦੇ ਰਿਸਟੋਰਰਾਂ ਤੇ ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਸੁਪਰਵਾਈਜਰਾਂ ਦੀ ਤਨਖਾਹ ਵਿਸ਼ੇਸ਼ਤਾਵਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਲੈ ਕੇ ਚਾਪਲ ਪਟੀਸ਼ਨਾਂ ਦਾ ਨਿਪਟਾਰਾ ਕਰਦਿਆਂ ਹਾਈਕੋਰਟ ਨੇ ਇਸ ਮਾਮਲੇ ਵਿਚ ਮੁੱਖ ਜੱਜ ਵਲੋਂ ਮਨਜ਼ੂਰ ਹੁਕਮਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਨਾ ਮੰਨਣ 'ਤੇ ਪੰਜਾਬ ਸਰਕਾਰ ਨੂੰ ਸਖ਼ਤ ਵਟਕਾਰ ਲਗਾਈ ਹੈ। ਹਾਈਕੋਰਟ ਨੇ ਪੰਜਾਬ ਸਰਕਾਰ ਨੂੰ ਕਿਹਾ ਕਿ ਉਹ ਇਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਹੁਕਮਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਮੰਨਣ ਵਿਚ ਟਾਲਮਟਾਲ ਕਰਕੇ ਮੁੱਖ ਜੱਜ ਦੇ ਗਿਆਨ ਤੇ ਅਧਿਕਾਰ ਨੂੰ ਚੁਣੌਤੀ ਨਾ ਦੇਵੇ।

ਪਟੀਸ਼ਨਾਂ ਦਾ ਨਿਪਟਾਰਾ ਕਰਦਿਆਂ ਹਾਈਕੋਰਟ ਨੇ ਰਿਸਟੋਰਰਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਕਲਰਕਾਂ ਦੇ ਬਰਾਬਰ ਤੇ ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਸੁਪਰਵਾਈਜਰਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਜੂਨੀਅਰ ਅਸਿਸਟੈਂਟਾਂ ਦੇ ਬਰਾਬਰ ਤਨਖਾਹ ਦਿੱਤੇ ਜਾਣ ਦੇ ਹੁਕਮ ਦਿੱਤੇ ਹਨ।

ਮਾਮਲੇ ਵਿਚ ਪਟੀਸ਼ਨ ਦਾਇਰ ਕਰਦਿਆਂ ਰਿਸਟੋਰਰਾਂ ਤੇ ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਸੁਪਰਵਾਈਜਰਾਂ ਨੇ ਕਿਹਾ ਸੀ ਕਿ ਪੰਜਾਬ ਸਰਕਾਰ ਵਲੋਂ 2011 ਵਿਚ ਤਨਖਾਹ ਵਿਚ ਵਾਧਾ ਕੀਤਾ ਗਿਆ ਸੀ ਤੇ ਇਸਦੇ ਤਹਿਤ ਉਸ ਸਮੇਂ ਇਕ ਹੀ ਦਰਜੇ 'ਤੇ ਮੌਜੂਦ ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਸੁਪਰਵਾਈਜਰਾਂ, ਕਲਰਕਾਂ ਤੇ ਜੂਨੀਅਰ ਅਸਿਸਟੈਂਟਾਂ ਵਿਚੋਂ ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਸੁਪਰਵਾਈਜਰਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਛੱਡ ਕੇ ਹੋਰ ਦੋਵਾਂ ਨੂੰ 10300-34800 ਦਾ ਪੇਅ ਬੈਂਡ ਦਿੱਤਾ

ਗਿਆ। ਉਥੇ ਹੀ ਦੂਸਰੇ ਪਾਸੇ 2006 ਵਿਚ ਇਕ ਹੀ ਤਨਖਾਹ 'ਤੇ ਕੰਮ ਕਰਨ ਵਾਲੇ ਰਿਸਟੋਰਰਾਂ ਤੇ ਕਲਰਕਾਂ ਵਿਚੋਂ ਸਿਰਫ਼ ਕਲਰਕਾਂ ਨੂੰ 3 ਅਕਤੂਬਰ, 2011 ਨੂੰ ਜਾਰੀ ਨੋਟੀਫਿਕੇਸ਼ਨ ਨਾਲ 10300-34800 ਦਾ ਪੇਅ ਬੈਂਡ ਦੇ

**ਕਰਮਚਾਰੀਆਂ ਦੀ ਤਨਖਾਹ ਵਧਾਉਣ ਦੇ ਫੈਸਲੇ ਨੂੰ ਸੰਵਿਧਾਨ ਦਾ ਅਨੁਛੇਦ 229 ਦਿੰਦਾ ਹੈ ਮਨਜ਼ੂਰੀ \* ਹਾਈਕੋਰਟ ਦੇ ਰਿਸਟੋਰਰਾਂ ਤੇ ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਸੁਪਰਵਾਈਜਰਾਂ ਦੀ ਤਨਖਾਹ ਵਧਾਉਣ ਦੇ ਪੰਜਾਬ ਸਰਕਾਰ ਨੂੰ ਹੁਕਮ**

ਦਿੱਤਾ ਗਿਆ, ਜਦਕਿ ਉਸੇ ਪੱਧਰ 'ਤੇ ਕੰਮ ਕਰਨ ਵਾਲੇ ਰਿਸਟੋਰਰਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਇਸ ਦਾ ਲਾਭ ਨਹੀਂ ਦਿੱਤਾ ਗਿਆ। ਇਸ ਬਾਰੇ 'ਚ ਫੈਸਲਾ ਲੈਣ ਲਈ ਕਰਮਚਾਰੀਆਂ ਨੇ ਇਕ-ਗ੍ਰੀਪੀਜ਼ੈਂਟੇਸ਼ਨ ਹਾਈਕੋਰਟ ਵਿਚ ਸੋਪੀ, ਜਿਸ 'ਤੇ ਤਿੰਨ ਜੱਜਾਂ ਦੀ ਕਮੇਟੀ ਨੇ ਫੈਸਲਾ ਲੈਂਦਿਆਂ ਪੰਜਾਬ ਸਰਕਾਰ ਨੂੰ ਕਿਹਾ ਸੀ ਕਿ ਉਹ ਰਿਸਟੋਰਰਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਕਲਰਕਾਂ ਦੇ ਬਰਾਬਰ ਤੇ ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਸੁਪਰਵਾਈਜਰਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਕਲਰਕਾਂ ਤੇ ਜੂਨੀਅਰ ਅਸਿਸਟੈਂਟਾਂ ਦੇ ਬਰਾਬਰ ਤਨਖਾਹ ਦੇਣਾ। ਇਸ ਫੈਸਲੇ ਨੂੰ ਮਨਜ਼ੂਰੀ ਲਈ

ਮੁੱਖ ਜੱਜ ਕੋਲ ਭੇਜਿਆ ਗਿਆ ਸੀ। ਮੁੱਖ ਜੱਜ ਨੇ ਸੰਵਿਧਾਨ ਵਿਚ ਅਨੁਛੇਦ 229 ਦੇ ਤਹਿਤ ਵਾਧੇ ਦੇ ਹੁਕਮ ਜਾਰੀ ਕੀਤੇ ਸਨ, ਬਾਵਜੂਦ ਇਸਦੇ ਸਰਕਾਰ ਨੇ ਇਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਨਹੀਂ ਮੰਨਿਆ। ਇਸ ਮਗਰੋਂ ਪੰਜਾਬ ਸਰਕਾਰ ਦੇ ਰਵੱਈਏ ਨੂੰ ਚੁਣੌਤੀ ਦਿੰਦਿਆਂ ਪਟੀਸ਼ਨ ਕਰਤਾ ਹਾਈਕੋਰਟ ਵਿਚ ਪਹੁੰਚੇ। ਮਾਮਲੇ ਵਿਚ ਸੁਣਵਾਈ ਦੌਰਾਨ ਪੰਜਾਬ ਸਰਕਾਰ ਦੇ ਗੁਹਿ ਵਿਭਾਗ ਵਲੋਂ ਹਲਫ਼ਨਾਮਾ ਦਾਇਰ ਕੀਤਾ ਗਿਆ ਕਿ ਕੰਮ ਕਰਨ ਵਾਲੇ ਕਰਮਚਾਰੀਆਂ ਦੇ ਅਹੁਦੇ ਤੇ ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਦੇ ਅਹੁਦੇ ਦੀ ਪ੍ਰਕਿਰਤੀ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਪੇ ਸਕੇਲ ਤੇ ਪੇ ਬੈਂਡ ਅਲੱਗ ਹੁੰਦੇ ਹਨ। ਹਾਈਕੋਰਟ ਨੇ ਕਿਹਾ ਕਿ ਜੇਕਰ ਇਕ ਵਾਰ ਸਰਕਾਰ 2 ਅਹੁਦਿਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਬਰਾਬਰ ਮੰਨਦਿਆਂ ਸਮਾਨ ਤਨਖਾਹ ਦੇ ਰਹੀ ਸੀ ਤਾਂ ਅਜਿਹੇ ਵਿਚ ਹੁਣ ਕੰਮ ਦੀ ਪ੍ਰਕਿਰਤੀ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਅਲੱਗ-ਅਲੱਗ ਤਨਖਾਹ ਦੇਣ ਦੀ ਦਲੀਲ ਕਿੱਥੇ ਮੰਨੀ ਜਾ ਸਕਦੀ ਹੈ? ਹਾਈਕੋਰਟ ਨੇ ਪੰਜਾਬ ਸਰਕਾਰ ਨੂੰ ਹੁਕਮ ਦਿੱਤੇ ਕਿ 2011 ਵਿਚ ਤਨਖਾਹ ਵਿਚ ਵਾਧੇ ਦੇ ਸਮੇਂ ਤੋਂ ਹੀ ਰਿਸਟੋਰਰਾਂ ਤੇ ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਸੁਪਰਵਾਈਜਰਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਵਧੀ ਹੋਈ ਤਨਖਾਹ ਦਾ ਲਾਭ ਦਿੱਤਾ ਜਾਵੇ ਤੇ ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਦੇ ਏਰੀਅਰ 'ਤੇ 12 ਫੀਸਦੀ ਦਾ ਵਿਆਜ ਵੀ ਦਿੱਤਾ ਜਾਵੇ।

ਹਾਈਕੋਰਟ ਕਰਮਚਾਰੀਆਂ ਦੀ ਨੌਕਰੀ ਦੀ ਸਥਿਤੀ ਦੇ ਬਾਰੇ 'ਚ ਮੁੱਖ ਜੱਜ ਵਲੋਂ ਦਿੱਤੇ ਗਏ ਹੁਕਮ ਨੂੰ ਮੰਨਣ ਲਈ ਰਾਜ ਮਜ਼ਬੂਰ ਹੈ। ਸੰਵਿਧਾਨ ਦੀ ਧਾਰਾ 229 ਦੇ ਤਹਿਤ ਮੁੱਖ ਜੱਜ ਨੂੰ ਇਹ ਅਧਿਕਾਰ ਹੈ ਕਿ ਉਹ ਆਪਣੇ ਅਧੀਨ ਆਉਣ ਵਾਲੇ ਕਰਮਚਾਰੀਆਂ ਦੀ ਸੇਵਾ ਲਈ ਨਿਯਮ ਤੈਅ ਕਰ ਸਕੇ।

ਇਸ ਮਾਮਲੇ ਵਿਚ ਨਾ ਤਾਂ ਰਾਜਪਾਲ ਵਲੋਂ ਕੋਈ ਇਤਰਾਜ਼ ਦਰਜ ਕੀਤਾ ਗਿਆ ਹੈ ਤੇ ਨਾ ਹੀ ਰਾਜ ਸਰਕਾਰ ਵਲੋਂ ਅਜਿਹਾ ਕੋਈ ਨਿਯਮ ਸਾਹਮਣੇ ਰੱਖਿਆ ਗਿਆ ਹੈ, ਜਿਸ ਦੇ ਚਲਦੇ ਇਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਹੁਕਮਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਰੋਕਿਆ ਜਾਵੇ। ਇਹ ਮੁੱਖ ਜੱਜ ਦੇ ਅਧੀਨ ਹੈ ਕਿ ਉਹ ਉੱਚ ਜ਼ਿੰਮੇਵਾਰੀਆਂ ਲਈ ਉੱਚ ਤਨਖਾਹ ਨਿਰਧਾਰਿਤ ਕਰੇ।

ਪੰਜਾਬ ਸਰਕਾਰ  
ਆਮ ਰਾਜ ਪ੍ਰਬੰਧ ਵਿਭਾਗ  
(ਸਕੱਤਰੀਤ ਅਮਲਾ-5 ਸਾਖਾ)

ਚੁਕਮ

ਵਿੱਤ ਵਿਭਾਗ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਪੱਤਰ ਨੰ 1/27/2019-5FPI/263-267 ਮਿਤੀ 12.2.2020 ਨੂੰ ਜਾਰੀ ਕੀਤੇ ਆਦੇਸ਼ਾਂ ਦੇ ਸਨਮੁੱਖ 1. CWP 4456 of 2016 and COCP 161 of 2019 kanta kumari and others case filed on 02.03.2016 (2.) In CWP 4781 of COCP 101 of 2019 -Anita Sharma and anothers case filed on 04.3.2016 (3). In CWP 6354 of COCP 100 of 2019 -Balwinder singh and anothers case filed on 16.3.2016 (4). In CWP 6361 of 2016 COCP 99 of 2019 -Netar singh and anothers case filed on 16.3.2016 ਦੇ ਹੇਠ ਦਰਸਾਏ ਪਟੀਸ਼ਨਰਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਬਣਦਾ ਲਾਭ ਦਿੰਦੇ ਹੋਏ ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਦੇ ਨਾਵਾਂ ਸਾਹਮਣੇ ਦਰਸਾਏ ਤਨਖਾਹ ਸਕੇਲ ਗ੍ਰੈਡ ਪੇਅ ਨੋਸ਼ਨਲ ਤੌਰ ਤੇ ਰਿਵਾਇਜ਼ ਕੀਤੇ ਜਾਣੇ ਹਨ:-

i) CWP 4456 of 2016 and CoCp 161 of 2019 -kanta kumari and others

Sr No	Name of the Petitioners and Post	pay scale
1.	Kanta Kumari D/o Bhajna Ram (Restorer)	10300-34800+3200 GP
2.	Gurvinder Singh S/o Sh. Surjit Singh (Restorer)	10300-34800+3200 GP
3.	Dilbagh Singh S/o Sh. Gurbachan Singh (Restorer)	10300-34800+3200 GP
4	Sushil Kumar S/o Vijay Kumar. (Restorer)	10300-34800+3200 GP
5	Vikram Singh S/o Sh. Gurmail Singh(Restorer)	10300-34800+3200 GP
6	Tejinder Kaur D/o Sh. Ajaib Singh (Restorer)	10300-34800+3200 GP
7	Gurdas Singh S/o Sarwan Singh(Restorer)	10300-34800+3200 GP
8	Ramesh Chand S/o Chana Ram(Restorer)	10300-34800+3200 GP
9	Gurmukh Singh S/o Sampuran Singh(Restorer)	10300-34800+3200 GP
10	Parveen Gupta D/O Bishambar Dass (Restorer)	10300-34800+3200 GP
11	Meena Rani D/o Amar Nath (Restorer)	10300-34800+3200 GP

12	Rajinder Kaur D/o Ram Lal (Restorer)	10300-34800+3200 GP
13	Achhey Lal S/o Rameshwar Parshad (Restorer)	10300-34800+3200 GP
14	Harjit Singh S/o Satpal Singh (Restorer)	10300-34800+3200 GP
15	Raj Kumar s/o Amar Nath (Restorer)	10300-34800+3200 GP

ii) In CWP 4781 of CoCP 101 of 2019 -Anita Sharma and anothers

Sr No	Name of the Post of Petitioners	pay scale
1	Anita Sharma D/o Padam Nabh (Record Supervisor)	10300-34800+3200 GP
2	Amrik Kaur D/o Mehma Singh (Record Supervisor)	10300-34800+3200 GP

iii) In CWP 6354 of CoCP 100 of 2019 -Balwinder singh and anothers

Sr No	Name of the Petitioners and Post	pay scale
1	Balwinder Singh S/o Bhagan Singh (Painter)	5910-20200+2400.GP
2	Electrician (This post is not related to Punjab civil Secretariat)	5910-20200+2400.GP
3	Jagdeep Singh S/o Lachhman Singh (Fotedar)	5910-20200+2400.GP
4	Pradeep Kumar S/o Phona Ram (Bradma operator)	5910-20200+2400.GP
5	Rajinder Kumar S/o Ram Murti (Cycle Mechanic)	5910-20200+2400.GP
6	Arjan Singh Kali Ram (Gate keeper)	5910-20200+2400.GP

iv) In CWP 6361 of 2016 CoCP 99 of 2019 -Netar singh and anothers

Sr No	Name of the Petitioners and Post	pay scale
1	Netar Singh S/o Sadhu Singh (welfare and record security incharge)	10300-34800+3600 GP
2	Ranjit Kaur D/o Jagir Singh ( Asistant Librarian)	10300-34800+3200 GP
3	Sarla Davi D/o, Rangi Ram (Head Gate Keeper)	5910-20200+2800.GP



4	Parkash Chand S/O Sukh ram (Head Gate Keeper)	5910-20200+2800.GP
4	Satish Kumar rana S/o Hamel Chand Rana (Book Binder)	5910-20200+2400.GP
5	Jit Singh(retd) s/o Ralla Singh (Head Gate Keeper)	5910-20200+2800.GP
6	Jarnail Singh (retd) son of Hardayal Singh (Head Gate Keeper)	5910-20200+2800.GP

4. ਵਿੱਤ ਵਿਭਾਗ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਪੱਤਰ ਨੰ 1/27/2019-5FPI/263-267 ਮਿਤੀ 12.2.2020 ਨੂੰ ਜਾਰੀ ਕੀਤੇ ਹੁਕਮਾਂ ਦੇ ਸਨਮੁੱਖ ਉਕਤ ਪਟੀਸ਼ਨਰਾਂ ਦਾ ਤਨਖਾਹ ਸਕੇਲ ਗ੍ਰੇਡ ਪੇਅ ਮਿਤੀ 1.12.2011 ਤੋਂ ਨੈਸ਼ਨਲ ਤੌਰ ਤੇ ਰਿਵਾਇਜ਼ਡ ਕਰਦੇ ਹੋਏ ਉਕਤ ਕੇਸਾਂ ਦੇ ਸਬੰਧਤ ਪਟੀਸ਼ਨਰ ਨੂੰ ਸਿਵਲ ਰਿੱਟ ਪਟੀਸ਼ਨ ਦਾਇਰ ਕਰਨ ਦੀ ਮਿਤੀ ਤੋਂ ਪਹਿਲਾਂ ਦੇ 38 ਮਹੀਨਿਆਂ ਤੱਕ ਦੇ ਬਣਦੇ ਬਕਾਏ ਦਿੱਤੇ ਜਾਣੇ ਹਨ।

5. ਇਹ ਪੱਤਰ ਸਕੱਤਰੇਤ ਪ੍ਰਸ਼ਾਸਨ ਵਿੱਚ ਤੈਨਾਤ ਸਹਾਇਕ ਕੰਟਰੋਲ ਵਿੱਤ ਤੇ ਲੇਖਾ ਜੀ ਪਾਸੇ ਵੈਟ ਕਰਨ ਉਪਰੰਤ ਜਾਰੀ ਕੀਤਾ ਗਿਆ ਹੈ।

ਮਿਤੀ ਚੰਡੀਗੜ

12.6.2020

ਆਲੋਕ ਸੇਖਰ, ਆਈ ਏ ਐਸ

ਪ੍ਰਮੁੱਖ ਸਕੱਤਰ, ਆਮ ਰਾਜ ਪ੍ਰਬੰਧ ਵਿਭਾਗ

File No .GAD-EST50CC/5/2020-4E5 I/38321/2020

ਮਿਤੀ ਚੰਡੀਗੜ:22/6/2020

ਇਸ ਦਾ ਇੱਕ ਉਤਾਰਾ ਹੇਠ ਲਿਖਿਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਸੂਚਨਾ ਅਤੇ ਯੋਗ ਕਾਰਵਾਈ ਹਿੱਤ ਭੇਜਿਆ ਜਾਂਦਾ ਹੈ:-

1. ਮਹਾਲੇਖਾਕਾਰ (ਲੇਖਾ ਤੇ ਰੱਕਦਾਨੀ)/(ਆਡਿਟ), ਪੰਜਾਬ, ਚੰਡੀਗੜ੍ਹ।
2. ਮਹਾਲੇਖਾਕਾਰ (ਆਡਿਟ), ਪੰਜਾਬ, ਚੰਡੀਗੜ੍ਹ।
3. ਸੁਪਰਡੈਂਟ ਲੇਖਾ-1,2,3,4 ਅਤੇ 5 ਸਾਖਾਵਾਂ।
4. ਪ੍ਰਸ਼ਾਸਕੀ ਅਫਸਰ-1 ਅਤੇ 2 ਸਾਖਾਵਾਂ।
5. ਸਿਵਲ ਕੰਟਰੋਲ ਰੂਮ, ਪੰਜਾਬ ਸਿਵਲ ਸਕੱਤਰੇਤ.
6. ਸੁਪਰਡੈਂਟ ਅਮਲਾ-5 (3ਅ5)
7. ਸਬੰਧਤ ਕਰਮਚਾਰੀ

ਸੁਪਰਡੈਂਟ

File No .GAD-EST50CC/5/2020-4E5 I/38321/2020

ਮਿਤੀ ਚੰਡੀਗੜ:22/6/2020

ਉਪਰੋਕਤ ਦਾ ਉਤਾਰਾ ਵਿੱਤ ਵਿਭਾਗ (ਵਿੱਤ ਪ੍ਰਸ਼ੇਨਲ-1 ਸਾਖਾ) ਨੂੰ ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਦੇ ਪੱਤਰ ਨੰ: 1/27/2019-5FPI/263-267 ਮਿਤੀ 12.2.2020 ਦੇ ਹਵਾਲੇ ਵਿੱਚ ਅਗਲੇਰੀ ਕਾਰਵਾਈ/ ਸੂਚਨਾ ਹਿੱਤ ਭੇਜਿਆ ਜਾਂਦਾ ਹੈ।

ਸੁਪਰਡੈਂਟ