

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

**CWP No.21850 of 2012(O&M)**

**Date of decision:5.2.2016**

Shakti Kapoor

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab & ors.

... Respondents

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV NARAIN RAINA**

Present: Mr. Aditya, Advocate, for  
Mr. CL Verma, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Nikhil K. Chopra, D.A.G., Punjab.

1. To be referred to the Reporters or not?
2. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

**RAJIV NARAIN RAINA, J.(Oral)**

1. Multiple prayers have been made in this petition expressing various grievances ranging from release of revised pay scale arrears; unpaid salary when the petitioner was on medical leave: release of increments since 2002; the assignment of GPF number which is said not to have been allotted; salary for the period of suspension from 2006-2008; non-maintenance of service book; denial of promotion which all prayers in one petition appear to be suffering from misjoinder of causes of action. Since the grievances have been expressed by the petitioner, which are bothering him and the fact that the State has contested this case and filed a written statement pointing out to many extraordinary things in the career of the petitioner, it would be prudent and safer to order that the respondent department will take a comprehensive view of all the

grievances and settle them one by one and for all times, which final decision/s will be subject to challenge when the view of the administration on each of the aspects raised and claims made is made known.

2. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on any of the grievances made in this petition on their merits, this Court is of opinion that it would better serve ends of justice if the direction is issued to the competent authority in the State Government to consider and decide the claims made in the legal notice dated May 15, 2012 and in the present petition which may be treated as a supplementary representation to the legal notice. It is expected that the decision-maker would decide each of the issues by a separate order even though all of them may be contained in a single order and in doing so the petitioner would be offered an opportunity of hearing on his grouse. Let an order now be passed within four months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order. The petitioner will remain at liberty to take recourse of his legal remedies in case the decisions on any of moot points go against his interest and in case he still feels dissatisfied claiming that the decision rendered is not in accordance with law or his rights.

3. With these observations and directions, the petition stands disposed of.

**(RAJIV NARAIN RAINA)**  
**JUDGE**

**5.2.2016**  
**monika**