

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

(I) CWP-6971-2013 (O&M)  
Date of decision : 08.04.2015

Ashok Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

PEPSU Road Transport Corporation and others

...Respondents

(II) CWP-11240-2013 (O&M)  
Date of decision : 08.04.2015

Ashok Kumar Sharma

...Petitioner

Versus

PEPSU Road Transport Corporation and others

...Respondents

(III) CWP-19995-2013 (O&M)  
Date of decision : 08.04.2015

Balwinder Singh and others

...Petitioners

Versus

PEPSU Road Transport Corporation and others

...Respondents

(IV) CWP-3498-2013 (O&M)  
Date of decision : 08.04.2015

Ram Singh and others

...Petitioners

Versus

Financial Commissioner and Principal Secretary, Punjab and others

...Respondents

(V) CWP-22002-2013 (O&M)  
Date of decision : 08.04.2015

Raghbir Singh and others

...Petitioners

Versus

PEPSU Road Transport Corporation and others

...Respondents

(VI) CWP-22010-2013 (O&M)  
Date of decision : 08.04.2015

Darshan Singh and others

...Petitioners

Versus

PEPSU Road Transport Corporation and others

...Respondents

(VII) CWP-23679-2013 (O&M)  
Date of decision : 08.04.2015

Kulwant Singh and others

...Petitioners

Versus

PEPSU Road Transport Corporation and others

...Respondents

(VIII) CWP-21373-2014 (O&M)  
Date of decision : 08.04.2015

Karam Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

PEPSU Road Transport Corporation

...Respondent

(IX) CWP-21362-2014 (O&M)

Date of decision : 08.04.2015

Jagga Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

PEPSU Road Transport Corporation

...Respondent

(X) CWP-21363-2014 (O&M)

Date of decision : 08.04.2015

Major Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

PEPSU Road Transport Corporation

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN**

Present: Mr. Gagneshwar Walia, Advocate,  
Mr. P.S. Salar, Advocate,  
Mr. T.S. Sidhu, Advocate,  
Mr. Vikas Singh, Advocate,  
Mr. Divyadeep Walia, Advocate,  
Mr. Manish Dadwal, Advocate,  
Mr. N.S. Bhinder, Advocate,  
for the petitioner(s).

Ms. Harsimrat Rai, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. R.S. Khosla, Sr. Advocate,  
with Mr. K.S. Mamrat, Advocate,  
for respondent-PRTC.

Mr. Sumit Jain and Mr. Prantap Sharma, Advocates,  
for respondent No.1 in CWP-21363-2014.

**JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J. (Oral)**

In the above noticed writ petitions, the petitioners have laid claim for their pension/pensionary benefits from their employer, respondent-Pepsu Road Transport Corporation (PRTC).

At the very outset, the learned Senior counsel for respondent-PRTC, states that the respondent faced with scarcity of funds, made a statement before a Coordinate Bench of this Court in COCP No.3059 of 2012, that the amount claimed by the retired employees of PRTC shall be paid to them, by following the principle of seniority, which shall be reckoned from the respective dates of retirement. He proposes that the case of the present petitioners will also be dealt with on the same lines.

However, this Court is not impressed by the argument raised by the learned counsel for the respondent, particularly, when the petitioners were not party to the settlement arrived at between the parties in COCP No.3059 of 2012.

It has further been brought to the notice of this Court by Mr. Gagneshwar Walia, Advocate that PRTC is now running in profits and achieving its performance target as per the information received under the Right to Information Act, which has not been specifically denied by the counsel for the PRTC. A copy of the RTI information is taken on record as Annexure C-1.

The blood and sweat of the petitioners have moved the wheels of the respondent corporation. The State is ought to act as a

model employer in a welfare state. The denial or deferment of the payment that has accrued in their favour on superannuation is neither desirable nor justifiable on the ground laid by the learned Senior counsel for the corporation. The corporation with the team of qualified staff is headed by the senior officer of the State. In this backdrop, the question is as to how and why the corporation's financial health is so bad, whereas, all the private players have been making huge profits in the business of transportation.

Faced with the situation, the learned Senior counsel, on instructions, states that the entire dues will be paid to the present petitioners within four months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

On the statement so made, the learned counsel for the petitioners seek permission to withdraw their respective petitions. The prayer is allowed and the present writ petitions are dismissed as withdrawn.

However, it is made clear that in case, the payment is not made within the stipulated period, the present petition(s) shall be deemed to have been revived, without notice.

**08.04.2015**  
*atulsethi*

**(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)**  
**JUDGE**