



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

CWP-31564-2026
Date of Decision: 24.09.2026

ADITYA AND OTHERS

.....Petitioners

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. Nitesh Singla, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. Sahil R. Bakshi, AAG, Punjab

KULDEEP TIWARI, J.(Oral)

1. Through the instant petition, filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the petitioners seek quashing of the speaking order dated 27.01.2022 (Annexure P-4), whereby the earlier speaking order dated 23.03.2020 (Annexure P-3), passed in favour of the petitioners, was kept in abeyance till further orders on the ground that the seniority of Masters and Mistresses was under judicial scrutiny. The petitioners further seek a direction to the respondents to reconsider and decide their claim for stepping up of pay, particularly in view of the fact that the Master Cadre seniority list has since been finalized vide letter dated 14.05.2024 (Annexure P-5), but their claim has not yet been reconsidered or decided.

2. At the outset, learned counsel for the petitioners fairly submits that the petitioners already served the respondents with a legal



CWP-31564-2026

-2-

notice dated 27.04.2026 (Annexure P-12), with respect to their concerns/grievance, but the same is still awaiting consideration. Therefore, he submits that the petitioners, at this stage, would be satisfied in case, a direction is passed upon the respondents to decide the abovesaid legal notice.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. Sahil R. Bakshi, learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents and waives service. At the outset, he, on instructions from Ms.Jasvinder Kaur, Assistant Director, Office of the Directorate of School Education, Punjab, submits that the petitioners' claim for stepping up of pay, as set out in the legal notice (*supra*), shall be decided by the competent authority within a period of two months from today.

4. In view of the aforesaid statement, no further directions are required to be issued in the instant writ petition and the same is, accordingly, **closed**.

5. This Court, however, remains sanguine that the competent authority shall honour the assurance extended by learned State counsel.

6. However, in case the respondents fails to adhere to the aforesaid statement, the petitioners are at liberty to move an apt application/motion for revival of the instant petition,

7. **Disposed of accordingly.**

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

September 24, 2026
dharamvir

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