

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

236

Civil Writ Petition No.28372 of 2013
Date of decision: 14.05.2015

Sushilla Devi

....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE DAYA CHAUDHARY

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment? Yes/No
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not? Yes/No
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest? Yes/No

Present: Mr. Amardeep Hooda, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Harish Rathee, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

DAYA CHAUDHARY, J. (Oral)

Learned State counsel submits that the relief as sought for in the present petition has been sanctioned and the same is likely to be released to the petitioner within a short period whereas learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there is delay in release of the pensionary benefits and the petitioner is also entitled for interest.

Since, the relief sought in the present petition has been sanctioned and as such the present petition has become infructuous. As far as the grant of interest is concerned, the same has not been claimed in the present writ petition.

Dismissed as having become infructuous.

However, the petitioner is at liberty to move representation to the concerned authority with regard to payment of interest.

**(DAYA CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE**

May 14, 2015
sonia g.