

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

**CWP No.18258 of 2014 (O&M)
Date of decision : September 23, 2016**

Sumitra **..... Petitioner**

Versus

State of Punjab and others **..... Respondents**

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Pawan Kumar Goklaney, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. R.S. Pathania, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Vishnav Gandhi, Advocate for respondent No.3.

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)

Learned counsel for respondent No.3 has stated that amount of ₹2,80,000/- was released to the petitioner as per statement made in Annexure R-1. The balance amount of ₹2,97,486/- has been released vide cheque No.531934, dated 27.05.2016. In this way, the entire amount has been paid to the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the petitioner does not dispute the receipt of the said payments. However, it is stated that husband of the petitioner died in harness on 14.02.2011 and the payment has been made with delay. Therefore, the interest is also payable.

Admittedly, the payment has been made with delay. Therefore, respondent No.3 is directed to pay interest @ 9% per annum, starting from

14.05.2011 till its payment. The balance amount of interest shall be paid within three months from the date of receipt of copy of this order.

As such, the present petition is disposed of.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

September 23, 2016

sarita

Whether speaking / reasoned Yes

Whether Reportable: No