Sanjiv Kumar Sharma
2016.10.07 16:50
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 21290 of 2016 (O/M)
Date of decision : 7.10.2016

Urmila Rani ..... Petitioner (s)

Versus

Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam and others ..... Respondent (s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Sandeep Kotla, Advocate, for the petitioner.

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 learned counsel for the petitioner contends that in terms of the order dated 9.10.2015, passed by this Court in RA-CWP-416-2015 in CWP-19506-2013 (Annexure-P-2), the petitioner has made representation to the concerned department, seeking interest on belated settlement of retiral benefits. However, the representation of the petitioner dated 12.2.2016 (Annexure-P-3) has not been decided so far.

In these circumstances, without issuing notice to the opposite party, a direction is issued to the respondents to decide the representation of the petitioner dated 12.2.2016 (Annexure-P-3) within one month from the date of receipt of copy of this judgment.

Disposed of accordingly.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

7.10.2016
sjks

Whether speaking / reasoned : Yes

Whether Reportable : No