



2025:PHHC:179315

2025:PHHC:179315



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

121/23

CWP-21074-2025

Date of Decision: 24.12.2025

SUDHIR AND ORS

....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

....RESPONDENT(S)

121/27

CWP-22188-2025

PRAVESH AND OTEHRS

....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

....RESPONDENT(S)

121/59

CWP-25602-2025

LALIT ATTRI AND OTHERS

....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

....RESPONDENT(S)

121/61

CWP-30380-2025

SUBHASH KUMAR AND ORS

....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

....RESPONDENT(S)



-2-

....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

....RESPONDENT(S)

...PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

....RESPONDENT(S)

....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

...RESPONDENT(S)

....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

....RESPONDENT(S)



2025:PHHC:179315

2025:PHHC:179315



**CWP-21074-2025
and connected cases**

-3-

137 CWP-38052-2025

MANISH KUMAR AND OTHERS

....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

....RESPONDENT(S)

142 CWP-38327-2025

GAYATRI DEVI AND OTHERS

....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

....RESPONDENT(S)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Ankur Sidhar, Advocate,
Mr. Jasbir Mor, Advocate with
Mr. Virender Gill, Advocate,
Mr. Najim Khilluka, Advocate,
Mr. Nihal S. Chaoudhary, Advocate with
Ms. Anita S. Choudhary, Advocate,
Mr. Amit Aggarwal, Advocate,
Mr. Najim Khiluka, Advocate,
Mr. Arvind Galav, Advocate and
Mr. Ravinder Singh Dhull, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Pravindra Singh Chauhan, Advocate General Haryana with
Mr. Mr. Rahul Dev Singh, Addl. AG Haryana

Mr. Sukhdeep Parmar, Advocate
for respondent No.8 in CWP-22188-2025

Ms. Vibhuti Manchanda, Advocate for the respondents
in CWPs-31431-2025



2025:PHHC:179315

2025:PHHC:179315



**CWP-21074-2025
and connected cases**

-4-

Mr. Sukhdeep Parmar, Advocate
for respondent No.14 in CWP-25602-2025 and
for respondent No.14 in CWP-12264-2025

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J. (ORAL)

* * * *

Vide this common order, this Court intends to dispose of all the above-said petitions, as a common question of law is involved therein. For brevity, the facts are being taken from CWP-21074-2025.

Relief Sought

1. The present writ petition has been filed under Articles 226 of the Constitution of India seeking quashing of the impugned terms and conditions dated 05.08.2024 (Annexure P-9) to the extent of clauses 3 and 4 fixing remuneration even lesser than the minimum wages, with further prayer to direct the respondents to grant equal pay/service benefits to the petitioners for performing duties equal to Data Entry Operators since their appointments and also direct the respondents to pay the petitioners compensation to the tune of Rs.1 lac each and release the pending/delayed salaries of the petitioners with interest @ 12% per annum.

Arguments raised on behalf of the petitioner

2. The petitioners are aggrieved by certain terms and conditions incorporated in their appointment letters, which were communicated to them



**CWP-21074-2025
and connected cases**

-5-

at a later stage, fixing their remuneration at a meagre sum of Rs.6,000/- per month. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that such remuneration is below the minimum wages prescribed by the State Government, thereby violating statutory provisions.

3. Learned counsel further contends that despite the terms and conditions of their appointments, the respondents have not released the salaries of the petitioners for the last 8–9 months, without assigning any reasons.

4. Notice of Motion was issued on 25.07.2025.

5. Sh. Pravindra Singh Chauhan, learned Advocate General, Haryana, having appeared before this Court today to render assistance in the matter, who undertook that the State shall undertake a fresh consideration of the matter with regard to issue concerning entitlement of the petitioners to minimum wages by examining the case of each petitioner independently and shall pass appropriate orders in accordance with law and applicable legal provisions.

Conclusion

The respective counsel for the petitioner(s) are ad idem to the stand taken by learned Advocate General and have shown satisfaction, therefore, they do not wish to press the instant petition(s) any further.



**CWP-21074-2025
and connected cases**

-6-

6. In view of the assurance tendered by the learned Advocate General, Haryana, and the concurrence of learned counsel for the petitioners, this Court is satisfied that the issue concerning the petitioners' entitlement to minimum wages shall be reconsidered afresh and decided strictly in accordance with the law.

8. This court is mindful of the intention of the Minimum Wages Act, 1948, and related statutory provisions, which exist to ensure that employees are guaranteed a basic standard of remuneration sufficient to maintain a decent standard of living, and the State is under a statutory obligation to comply with these provisions.

9. In light of the above since the respondents are committed to examine the claim of each petitioner individually, the nature of the duties performed, and the statutory minimum wage requirements, and to pass reasoned orders within four weeks from the receipt of a copy of this order. Further wherever the petitioners have not been paid their salaries, the same shall be released along with arrears.

10. The Court also clarifies that in case the petitioners have not submitted any representation so far to the State Government or the concerned Head of the Department, the present writ petitions shall be treated as deemed representations, which must be considered in the fresh adjudication.

11. Accordingly, in view of the above, all the present writ petitions stand disposed of.



2025:PHHC:179315

2025:PHHC:179315



**CWP-21074-2025
and connected cases**

-7-

12. Pending miscellaneous applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

A copy of this order shall be placed on the files of other connected cases.

**(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE**

24.12.2025

NainaRajput

Whether speaking/reasoned

:Yes/No

Whether reportable

:Yes/No