

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

**Civil Writ Petition No.23745 of 2016
Date of Decision: 18.11.2016**

Harjinder Pal

..... Petitioner

Versus

Punjab State Power Corporation Limited, Patiala and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASWANT SINGH

Present: Dr. Rau P.S. Girwar, Advocate for the petitioner.

JASWANT SINGH, J. (Oral)

The petitioner joined as Assistant Lineman on regular basis on 28.06.1977 with the erstwhile Punjab State Electricity Board (now P.S.P.C.L.). He was promoted as Lineman on 07.06.1986. He has retired on attaining the age of superannuation on 31.07.2010.

The prayer in the present petition is for grant of the benefit of promotional increment on completion of 23 years of regular service in terms of the Finance Circular No.17/90 issued on 23.04.1990 (**Annexure P-1**).

Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that similarly situated employees have been extended the benefit of the said promotional increment in terms of the Circular (**P-1**) by this Court and has referred the orders at **Annexures P-6 to P-8** and thus prays for similar direction.

After hearing learned Counsel for the petitioner and perusing the orders (**P-6 to P-8**), no case for any direction is warranted.

The case set up by the petitioner is that he is entitled to the benefit of the promotional increment w.e.f. 27.06.2000 on completion of 23 years of service. The cause of action thus accrued to him in the year 2000 and would be a recurring cause of action till his date of retirement on 31.07.2010. Concededly, the petitioner took no steps till filing of his representation dated 23.02.2016 (**Annexure P-12**). It is also an admitted fact that the relationship of the employer and employee stood terminated except to the limited extent of granting monthly pension to the petitioner. The petitioner since the year 2010 till 2016 took no steps whatsoever and, therefore, at least from the expiry of 3 years from the date of his retirement, in the opinion of this Court, the claim would be time barred.

In the referred orders (**P-6 to P-8**), concededly, the position is different. Thus, in the opinion of this Court, no case for interference is warranted.

Accordingly, the present petition stands dismissed.

November 18, 2016

Gagan

(JASWANT SINGH)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>