



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

115

**CWP-29169-2026 (O&M)
Date of decision: 24.09.2026**

Satyabir Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Mukesh Yadav, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rahul Dev Singh, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this writ petition filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, is for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus, directing the respondents to consider and decide the legal notice dated 27.07.2026 (Annexure P-5) and grant stepping-up of the pay of the petitioner at par with his junior.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends that the petitioner was appointed as a JBT Teacher on 24.11.1995 and promoted as Head Teacher on 04.09.2002, whereas his junior, Rattan Lal, was appointed as JBT Teacher on 12.10.1997 and promoted as Head Teacher on 21.08.2002. He submits that despite being senior, the petitioner was drawing lower pay than his junior and was entitled to grant of first ACP on completion of eight years. However, the petitioner



was granted first ACP only w.e.f. 01.07.2014, though it was due from 01.10.2012, whereas Rattan Lal was granted the same w.e.f. 01.09.2012 as is evident from Annexures P-1 and P-2, respectively. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner served a legal notice dated 05.06.2023 (Annexure P-3), but no action was taken thereon. The petitioner thereafter filed **CWP-312-2024**, which was dismissed as withdrawn on **09.01.2024** (Annexure P-4) with liberty to raise his grievance before the respondents. Thereafter the petitioner approached the respondent/department and submitted all the requisite documents on several occasions, however, the matter was not decided. Consequently, the petitioner served another legal notice dated 27.07.2026 (Annexure P-5), which also remains unheeded till date.

2.1. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he would be satisfied if the legal notice (Annexure P-5) of the petitioner is decided by respondent/competent authority by passing a speaking order in a time bound manner.

3. Learned State counsel, appearing on advance notice, submits that he has no objection, in case a direction is issued to the respondent/competent authority for time-bound consideration and decision of the legal notice (Annexure P-5) of the petitioner by passing a speaking order.

4. Therefore, in view of the limited prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner, the respondent/competent authority is directed to consider the legal notice (Annexure P-5) of the petitioner and pass a



speaking order, after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner, within a period of 03 months from the date of receiving a certified copy of this order. Further, the decision taken thereof shall be conveyed to the petitioner. Needless to say, if the petitioner is found entitled to the relief sought, the same shall be granted forthwith by respondent/competent authority.

5. Disposed of, accordingly.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

24.09.2026

yakub

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No