



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

**LPA No.1010 of 2025 (O&M)**

**Date of Decision: 01.07.2025**

Din Dayal

...Appellant

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA  
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA**

Present:- Ms. Mansi, Advocate for  
Mr. Bhisham Kumar Majoke, Advocate  
for the appellant.

\*\*\*\*\*

**SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA, J.(Oral)**

**CM No.2498-LPA of 2025**

For the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is allowed and the delay of 236 days in re-filing the present appeal is condoned.

**CM No.2497-LPA of 2025**

For the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is allowed and the delay of 44 days in filing the instant appeal is condoned.

**LPA No.1010 of 2025**

1. The appeal assails the order passed by learned Single Judge dated 18.04.2024 in *CWP No.1653 of 2019* whereby the writ-petition filed by the appellant-writ petitioner was dismissed.

2. Learned counsel appearing for the appellant has vehemently argued that the order passed by learned Single Judge deserves to be set-aside as the prayer made by the writ-petitioner deserves to be allowed as earlier both the departments were one and merely because both the departments have



been bifurcated, the writ-petitioner ought not been denied the benefits which have already been given to a person, who was junior to him namely Bacha Narayan whose salary is higher than the writ-petitioner/appellant. Otherwise, his pay should be also declared equivalent to be that of Laboratory Attendant.

3. On both the counts, we find that learned Single Judge has examined the case thoroughly and has reached to the conclusion that the step-up of salary as claimed by the writ-petitioner viz-a-viz Bacha Narayan is not made out as the writ-petitioner is in the Department of Food and Drugs at the station while Bacha Narayan continues in the Health Department. Both the departments being different, there is no question of inter-se seniority between the writ-petitioner and Bacha Narayan.

4. We also notice that the claim of parity of pay to that of Laboratory Attendant on the basis of notification dated 21.02.1992 is also not made out as the writ-petitioner has been working on the post of Swasthya Sahayak which is a Class-IV post and does not fall within the notification dated 21.02.1992. Thus, on both the counts, the claim of the writ-petitioner/appellant has rightly been rejected. No case for interference is made out. The present appeal is dismissed.

5. Pending miscellaneous application(s) also stand disposed of.

**(SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA)**  
**JUDGE**

**01.07.2025**  
neetu

**(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)**  
**JUDGE**

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