

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.1526 of 2012

Date of Decision:- 17.09.2015.

Dharam Pal

.....Petitioner

Versus

Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam (UHBVN) 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: Mr. R.N. Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Aseem Sharma, Advocate for
Mr. K.S. Khehar, Advocate for the respondents.

P.B. BAJANTHRI, J.

1.) In this petition, the petitioner has prayed for direction to the respondents to pay interest on belated settlement of retiral benefits amounting to ₹ 11.35 lakhs.

2.) The petitioner was appointed as a Meter Reader on 8.1.1975 and he had earned promotions to the cadre of Lower Division Clerk and Upper Division Clerk. On 31.8.2010 he had attained the age of superannuation and retired from service. His retiral benefits were not settled within the time limit stipulated under the Instructions dated 11.12.2008 vide Annexure P-6. The

respondents settled the retiral benefits of the petitioner in the month of July, 2011 and August, 2011 vide Annexure P-2 and P-3, respectively. However, no interest was paid pursuant to policy of the State dated 11.12.2008 vide Annexure P-6.

3.) The respondents have filed their statement of objections and contended that there were some objections from the Accounts Department in updating the service book of the petitioner. Therefore, there was a delay in settling retiral benefits. There is no intentional delay in setting the retiral benefits. In view of the facts and circumstances of the case, admittedly, there is delay in settling retiral dues of the petitioner, therefore, the petitioner is entitled to interest on belated payment of retiral benefits from December 2010 till July-August, 2011 @ 9% per annum.

4.) Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of.

5.) The aforesaid order is to be complied by the respondents within a period of ten weeks from today.

(P.B. BAJANTHRI)
JUDGE

September 17, 2015.

sandeep sethi