

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

**CWP-6340-2015(O&M)
Date of Decision: 06.04.2015**

RANDHIR SINGH AND OTHERSPETITIONERS

VS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERSRESPONDENTS

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present: Mr.R.S.Kundu, Advocate for the petitioners.

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?

AJAY TEWARI, J. (Oral)

The petitioners in this present petition are seeking a direction to the respondents to grant them over time allowance as per the past practice in view of the provisions of Section 13 of the Motor Transport Worker Act, 1961. In this connection they are also stated to have got issued a legal notice dated 20.08.2014(Annexure P-7) to the respondents which has not been decided as yet. Learned counsel states that at this stage the petitioners would be satisfied if a direction is issued to respondents No.3 to decide the legal notice of those petitioners who are posted at Panipat depot and also a direction to respondent No.4 to decide the said legal notice of those petitioners who are posted at Ambala, in accordance with law.

I find this to be a fair request.

Resultantly this petition is disposed of with a direction to

respondent No.4 to decide the legal notice(Annexure P-7) of those petitioners who are posted at Ambala and to respondent No.3 to decide the said legal notice of those petitioners who are posted at Panipat within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order in accordance with law by passing a speaking order thereon.

Since the main case has been decided, the Civil Misc. Application, if any, also stands disposed of.

(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE

April 06, 2015
sunita