

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

CWP No. 2412 of 2014 (O&M)
Date of decision: 13.10.2015

Krishan Dayal

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab & others

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE G.S.SANDHAWALIA

Present: Mr.D.P.S.Randhawa, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr.Pankaj Mulwani, DAG, Punjab.

G.S.SANDHAWALIA, J. (Oral)

Petitioner seeks the relief of release of the pending arrears of missing credits along with 18% per annum on the delayed amount and for counting the petitioner's service w.e.f. 18.05.1972 to 26.11.1974 and to grant consequential benefits, as per the representation dated 30.09.2013 (Annexure P8) and the legal notice dated 31.10.2013 (Annexure P10).

In the written statement, filed by respondent No.3, District Education Officer, District Hoshiarpur, it has been mentioned that the petitioner had retired from Government service on 31.03.2002 and the final payment of G.P.F. amounting to Rs.3,15,316/-, had been made immediately on 31.05.2002, except the payment of missing credit period. The details, thereafter, have been mentioned that the vouchers were calculated and the total amount of the missing period along with interest up to 31.03.2004, amounting to Rs.24,856/-, were sanctioned vide order dated 19.03.2004 and paid to the petitioner. Similarly, an amount of Rs.502/- which was due along with interest was calculated and an amount of Rs.6640/- was paid up to 31.03.2010 and thus, the amount of missing credit along with interest has been paid and nothing is due against the respondents.

Regarding the second issue of counting the services of the petitioner in the privately managed aided post, it was averred that in view of the judgment rendered in CWP No.14238 of 1991 titled *Sukhdev Singh & others Vs. State of Punjab & others*, decided on 10.03.2010, the petitioner has been given the benefit of the services rendered by him in the privately aided schools, for the purposes of pensionary benefits, vide order dated 15.07.2014 (Annexure R1).

The said averments have not been controverted by filing replication by the petitioner. Accordingly, it is apparent that the relief has been granted to the petitioner.

Writ petition is, accordingly, disposed of, as having been rendered infructuous.

13.10.2015
sailesh

(G.S. SANDHAWALIA)
JUDGE