

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

**CWP No.16772 of 2012 (O&M)  
Date of decision : December 16, 2016**

**Jagdish Chander**

**..... Petitioner**

**Versus**

**State of Punjab and others**

**..... Respondents**

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH**

**Present:-** Mr. Raj Paul Kansal, Advocate for the petitioner.  
Mr. R.S. Pathania, DAG, Punjab.

1. Whether the Reporters of local newspaper may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not.
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ?

**KULDIP SINGH J. (ORAL)**

The present petitioner is the pre 01.01.2006 retiree from Education Department, having retired on 30.06.1997. The prayer is for revision of pension after quashing the letter dated 13.06.2012 (Annexure P-4) issued by respondent No.2.

The learned counsels for the petitioner, who is present in Court today, states that the matter has been finally decided by a coordinate bench of this Court in CWP No. 25733 of 2012, titled as “***A.P. Sharma and others Versus State of Punjab and others***”, decided on 22.10.2013 and by this Court in CWP No. 2866 of 2014, titled as “***Karanvir Singh and others vs State of Punjab and others***”, decided on 30.9.2016 alongwith connected matters. It is stated that the Letters Patent Appeal No. 352 of 2014, titled as “***State of Punjab and others vs A.P. Sharma and others***” alongwith connected matters against the judgment of a Single Bench of this Court in ***A.P. Sharma's case (supra)*** has since been dismissed by a Division Bench of this Court, vide order dated 31.08.2016 and it has become final.

Therefore, the short prayer is to dispose of the present writ petition in terms of the judgments of this Court, passed in ***A.P. Sharma's case (supra)*** and in ***Karanvir Singh's case (supra)***.

In these circumstances, the present writ petition is disposed of with directions to the respondents to consider the case of the petitioner in the light of the judgments of this Court passed in ***A.P. Sharma's and Karanvir Singh's cases (supra)*** and if it is found that the petitioner is covered by the said judgments, then extend the similar benefits to the petitioner also in those petitions and in case, it is found that he is not covered by the said judgments, then pass a speaking order, denying the said benefits. The needful be done within three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this judgment. If it is found that the petitioner is entitled to the arrears, the same shall also be released within two months from the date of passing of speaking order alongwith with interest, as per the Government instructions.

**(KULDIP SINGH)**  
**JUDGE**

**December 16, 2016**

sarita

Whether speaking / reasoned                      Yes

Whether Reportable:                                      No