

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

Sr. No.209

**CWP No.22250 of 2013
Date of decision: 31.05.2016**

Ashok Kumar Ghai and others ...Petitioners

versus

The Employees Provident Fund Organization and othersRespondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL

Present: Mr. Jai Bhagwan Sharma, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. Sanjay Tangri, Advocate
for respondents No.1 and 2.

None for respondent No.3.

* * *

DEEPAK SIBAL, J. (Oral)

Through the present petition, the petitioners claim a higher rate of pension under the provisions of the Employees' Pension Scheme, 1995.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the pension of the petitioners as claimed through the present petition has been granted to them and the only issue that remains as on date is the claim of the petitioners with regard to payment of interest on the revised pension which they are in receipt of.

For the afore-referred claim for interest, learned counsel for the parties are in agreement that the present petition can be disposed of in terms of an order passed by this Court in **CWP No.22600 of 2013** titled as **Om**

Parkash Sharma and another versus Employees Provident Fund

Organization and others, decided on 30.10.2014, wherein the following directions were given:-

“So far as the claim of the petitioners regarding interest on delayed payment is concerned, the petitioners shall be at liberty to move appropriate representation before respondent No.1 who shall consider and decide the same within a period of two months from the receipt of the representation by passing an appropriate order thereupon, in accordance with law.”

In view of the above referred consensus arrived at between the learned counsel for the parties for the claim of the petitioners with regard to interest, in terms of the afore-quoted directions in **Om Parkash Sharma's case (supra)**, the petitioners shall be at liberty to move an appropriate representation before respondent No.2 who shall consider and decide the same within a period of two months from the date of receipt of such representation by passing thereupon a speaking order and after granting opportunity of hearing to the petitioners.

Needless to add that the decision so taken be communicated to the petitioners and if the decision is not to the satisfaction of the petitioners, they would be at liberty to challenge the same, in accordance with law.

(DEEPAK SIBAL)
JUDGE

May 31, 2016
Jyoti 1