

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

(343)

CWP No.4979 of 1997 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 16.09.2015.

Inder Sain Garg

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P.B. BAJANTHRI

1. Whether Reporters of local papers 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: None for the petitioner.

Mr. Saurabh Mohunta, DAG, Haryana.

P.B. BAJANTHRI, J.(Oral)

The matter was called. None appears on behalf of the petitioner. Even on the last occasion no one presented on behalf of the petitioner. The matter was heard with the assistance of the State counsel.

In this petition, petitioner has questioned Annexure P-4 dated 10.01.1997 an internal communication between Senior Accounts Officer and the District Education Officer, Jind relating to revision of pension of the petitioner. The said communication is relating to transmission of service book with certain objections.

The petitioner joined service as JBT Teacher on 18.12.1961. He was promoted as a Punjabi Teacher on 18.06.1979 and he has taken voluntary retirement on 31.07.1989.

For non-grant of JST scale on acquiring higher qualification

petitioner was compelled to approach this Court. On 09.08.1995, this Court allowed his CWP No. 522 of 1994 and directed the respondent-Department to grant JST scale. It is learnt that directions of this court came to be complied with effect from 14.06.1972, the date on which petitioner acquired higher qualification. Consequently, petitioner's pension was to be revised, since the same was denied, he is before this Court questioning the internal communication between the Senior Accounts Officer and the District Education Officer, Jind and further sought for a direction to undertake revision of pension and to disburse arrears of pension, gratuity along with interest.

Learned State counsel submitted that on 16.09.1998 and 26.10.1998 grievance of the petitioner insofar as revision of retiral benefits have been disbursed this is not disputed by the petitioner in view of communication made by the petitioner to the respondents-Department on 05.07.1999.

In view of these facts and circumstances, the petition do not survive for consideration insofar as grant of revised retiral benefits. Insofar as grant of interest on belated payment, the petitioner is entitled to interest @ 9% per annum. Same shall be paid by the respondent Department by calculating within a period of 10 weeks'.

Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of.

16.09.2015

pooja saini

(P.B.BAJANTHRI)
JUDGE