



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

103

COCP 2308-2023 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 25.09.2025

Prem Singh (now deceased) through his LR's and another Petitioners

Versus

Shri Mahavir Singh and another

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NIDHI GUPTA

Present: - None for the petitioners.

Mr. Naveen Kumar, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

NIDHI GUPTA, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed alleging violation of order dated 12.12.2007 (Annexure P-1) passed in CWP-2071-1986 titled as 'Om Parkash and others vs. State of Haryana and others' and other connected petitions including CWP-5328-1990 titled as 'Surjit Singh and others vs. State of Haryana and others' filed by the present petitioners, whereby the respondents were directed as under:-

"It is a conceded position that Physical Training Instructors (NFC) later challenged order dated 30.03.1994 as referred to above in C.W.P. No. 5816 of 1984, that writ petition was allowed. Order was set aside and the P.T.Is (NFC) and DPE (NFC) were held entitled to the payment of higher pay scale. That being so, this Court feels that in view of the ratio of the judgment in Ram Kishan Ahlawat (supra), the petitioners are also entitled to get the higher pay scales as has been granted in favour of the P.T.I(NFC) by the Court in C.W.P. No. 5816 of 1994 titled as National Fitness Corporation Teachers Association v. State of Haryana & others, decided on 10.10.2007.

This writ petition stands allowed in the above terms."

2. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that the directions of the Writ Court reproduced above stands duly complied with



as, the revised pay scale has been granted to the petitioners vide order dated 25.08.2025, in pursuance to which the benefits were released to the petitioner vide order dated 22.08.2025; and case of both the petitioners, namely, Prem Singh and Raja Ram, for revision of their pension have also been sent by the respondents to the Principal, Accountant General, Haryana on dated 29.08.2025 and 29.08.2027, respectively. Learned counsel for the respondents thus, submits that nothing survives in the present petition.

3. Copies of the aforesaid orders along with copies of account statements of both the petitioners reflecting the payments released into their accounts handed over in Court by learned counsel for the petitioners are taken on record.

4. Even in the second round of hearing, there is no representation on behalf of the petitioner.

5. Heard.

6. In view of the facts noted above, no further direction is required to be passed; and the present petition is hereby **disposed of**, accordingly.

7. Rule stands discharged.

8. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

25.09.2025

rishu

(**NIDHI GUPTA**)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned **Yes/No**

Whether Reportable **Yes/No**