

**Sr. No.225 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**COCP No. 2479 of 2015
Date of decision:14.09.2016**

Baj Singh

.....Petitioner

versus

Sikander and another

.....Respondents

Coram: Hon'ble Mr.Justice Rakesh Kumar Jain

Present: Mr. Puneet Kumar Bansal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Anant Kataria, DAG, Punjab.

Rakesh Kumar Jain, J.(Oral)

Counsel for the petitioner has admitted that the order passed by this Court has been complied with except for revision of pension.

In this regard, State counsel has submitted that after refixation of pay, the proposal for revision of pension has been submitted to the competent authority i.e. Accountant General Punjab vide letter dated 31.03.2016. It is further submitted that on the basis thereof, this petition has become infructuous.

Counsel for the petitioner has further submitted that since the arrears have been restricted to 38 months, therefore, he may be allowed to make appropriate representation.

In view thereof, the present petition is hereby disposed of. In case, such a representation is made, the same shall be decided by the competent authority within a period of three months.

14th September, 2016

Shivani Kaushik

**[Rakesh Kumar Jain]
Judge**

Whether Speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No