

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH.

C.O.C.P. No.2656 of 2014 (O&M)
DATE OF DECISION : 20.10.2015

Ashok Kumar Bhandari

PETITIONER

VERSUS

Abhishek Likhk

RESPONDENT

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE MAHESH GROVER

1. Whether reporters of Local Newspapers may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not ?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest ?

Present:- Shri Sachin Gupta Ladwa, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms.Madhu Dayal, Advocate for the respondent.

MAHESH GROVER, J.

The order of the Writ Court mandated consideration on the legal notice submitted by the petitioner and to release the service emoluments in case of his entitlement being established.

The reply filed by the respondent indicates that consideration was granted to the petitioner and after finding him entitled to the release of service benefits, he same has been done.

Except for an amount of Rs.15,000/- and odd which has been retained for certain reasons explained in the order Annexure R-15 attached with the reply, the remaining amounts have been released to the petitioner. This fact is not controverted by the petitioner.

In this view of the matter, the present contempt petition has largely been rendered infructuous. The grievance of the petitioner now is that he retired in the year 2008 and the benefits have been released belatedly in 2015 even though the order of the Writ Court warranted a consideration in 2013 within four months.

I find substance in this and therefore, direct the respondents to calculate interest at the rate of 9% per annum from the date the petitioner retired till the date of payment. The petitioner has already made a representation in this regard and therefore, the respondents are directed to dispose of the said representation within a period of four weeks from today positively. The order has been passed in the presence of the parties and therefore, the Court would not accept any justification for non-compliance of the directions being issued.

The instant petition is disposed of as having been satisfied leaving the petitioner to his remedies under the law.

October 20, 2015
GD

(MAHESH GROVER)
JUDGE