

CWP No. 26520 of 2014 and other connected cases

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

1 CWP No. 26520 of 2014

Kulbir Singh ... *Petitioner*
Vs.
Pepsu Road Transport Corporation and another ..*Respondents*

2. CWP No. 26538 of 2014

Nirmal Kumar ... *Petitioner*
Vs.
Pepsu Road Transport Corporation and Others ...*Respondents*

3. CWP No. 26632 of 2014

Jagjit Singh ... *Petitioner*
Vs.
Pepsu Road Transport Corporation, Patiala and another ...*Respondents*

4. CWP No. 1952 of 2015

Jagjit Singh *Petitioner*
Vs.
Managing Director, Pepsu Road Transport Corporation and another ...*Respondents*

5. CWP No. 10361 of 2015

Baldev Raj and others ... *Petitioners*
Vs.
Pepsu Road Transport Corporation, Patiala and another...*Respondents*

6. CWP No. 20545 of 2015

Manjit Kaur ... *Petitioner*
Vs.
The State of Punjab and Others ...*Respondents*

7. CWP No. 24984 of 2015

Amarjit Singh and others ... *Petitioners*
Vs.
Pepsu Road Transport Corporation, Patiala ...*Respondent.*

CWP No. 26520 of 2014 and other connected cases

8. **CWP No. 25040 of 2015**
Charanjit Singh and others ... *Petitioners*
Vs.
Pepsu Road Transport Corporation, Patiala ... *Respondent*

9. **CWP No. 27018 of 2015**
Atma Singh and others ... *Petitioners*
Vs.
Pepsu Road Transport Corporation, Patiala & others ... *Respondents*

10. **CWP No. 5990 of 2016**
Balvir Singh ... *Petitioner*
Vs.
Pepsu Road Transport Corporation and Another ... *Respondents*

11. **CWP No. 7812 of 2016**
Swaran Singh and others ... *Petitioners*
Vs.
Pepsu Road Transport Corporation, Patiala & Another ... *Respondents*

12. **CWP No. 8007 of 2016**
Subhash Chand and others ... *Petitioners*
Vs.
Pepsu Road Transport Corporation, Patiala ... *Respondent*

13. **CWP No. 8159 of 2016**
Hardev Singh and others ... *Petitioners*
Vs.
Pepsu Road Transport Corporation, Patiala ... *Respondent*

14. **CWP No. 8329 of 2016**
Manjit Singh Brar and others ... *Petitioners*
Vs.
Pepsu Road Transport Corporation, Patiala ... *Respondent*

15. **CWP No. 8928 of 2016**
Rajinder Singh and others ... *Petitioners*
Vs.
Pepsu Road Transport Corporation, Patiala & Another ... *Respondents*

CWP No. 26520 of 2014 and other connected cases**16.****CWP No. 10331 of 2016*****Satpal Singh and others******... Petitioners******Vs.******Pepsu Road Transport Corporation, Patiala & Another ...Respondents*****Date of Decision: 23.07.2016****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH**

Present: Mr. Malkeet Singh Balianwali, Advocate for the petitioner(s),
in CWP No. 26520 of 2014, CWP No. 26538 of 2014 and
CWP No. 26632 of 2014.

Mr. Vikas Singh, Advocate for petitioner(s),
in CWP No. 8928 of 2016, CWP No. 7812 of 2016,
CWP No. 27018 of 2015, CWP No. 10361 of 2015,
and CWP No. 10331 of 2016.

Mr. L.S. Lakhanpal, Advocate for the petitioner(s),
in CWP No. 1952 of 2015.

Mr. Rakesh Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner(s),
in CWP No. 20545 of 2015.

Mr. Arvinder Singh, Advocate for the petitioner(s),
in CWP No. 5990 of 2016.

Mr. Vikas Chatrath, Ms. Neeru Thakur and
Mr. Raman Brar, Advocates, for the petitioner(s).
in CWP No. 24984 of 2015, CWP No. 8329 of 2016,
CWP No. 25040 of 2015, CWP No. 8159 of 2016 and
CWP No. 8007 of 2016.

Mr. Aman Sharma, Advocate, for the respondent(s),
in CWP No. 26520 of 2014, CWP No. 26538 of 2014,
CWP No. 26632 of 2014, CWP No. 20545 of 2015,
CWP No. 27018 of 2015, CWP No. 10361 of 2015,
CWP No. 24984 of 2015, CWP No. 25040 of 2015,
CWP No. 5990 of 2016, CWP No. 7812 of 2016 and
CWP No. 10331 of 2016.

Mr. Sandeep Kaur, Advocate for the respondent(s),
in CWP No. 1952 of 2015.

Mr. Nitin Kaushal, Advocate and Mr. Shekhar Kumar,
Advocate for the respondent(s) ,
in CWP No. 8007 of 2016, CWP No. 8159 of 2016,
CWP No. 8329 of 2016 and CWP No. 8928 of 2016.

1. *Whether the Reporters of local newspaper may be allowed to see the judgment? Yes*
2. *To be referred to the Reporter or not. Yes*
3. *Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest? Yes*

CWP No. 26520 of 2014 and other connected cases**KULDIP SINGH (J.)**

This order of mine shall dispose of sixteen connected civil writ petitions bearing No. CWP No. 26520 of 2014, CWP No. 26538 of 2014, CWP No. 26632 of 2014, CWP No. 1952 of 2015, CWP No. 10361 of 2015, CWP No. 20545 of 2015, CWP No. 24984 of 2015, CWP No. 25040 of 2015, CWP No. 27018 of 2015, CWP No. 5990 of 2016, CWP No. 7812 of 2016, CWP No. 8007 of 2016, CWP No. 8159 of 2016, CWP No. 8329 of 2016, CWP No. 8928 of 2016, CWP No. 10331 of 2016.

Learned counsel for the respondents, in CWP No. 1952 of 2015, has filed the reply by way of affidavit of Mr. Ravinder Singh, Managing Director, Pepsu Road Transport Corporation, Patiala, and the same is taken on record.

The petitioners in all the writ petitions are the employees of the Pepsu Road Transport Corporation (for short "PRTC"). They claim that their retiral benefits i.e. gratuity, leave encashment, provident fund along with arrears and some part of pension have been withheld and the same should be released to them along with interest.

On behalf of the respondents, the liability to pay such retiral benefits is not denied. Today, Mr. Ravinder Singh, Managing Director, PRTC is present in Court and explained that he took over the charge of office only five months back in this Corporation and since then lot of improvement has been brought in the working of PRTC and within this short span of five months PRTC has earned profit of ₹ 30.00 Crore. It is also stated that major amount of the pensionary benefits have been released. Since, the liability is much more, therefore, the liability is being released in installments.

CWP No. 26520 of 2014 and other connected cases

It is further stated that the PRTC is not in a position to pay the entire amount of pensionary benefits in lump sum. As PRTC is running in losses and there is paucity of funds, due to which the payment could not be released, therefore, a request has been made that the interest as claimed by the petitioners should not be awarded.

The learned counsel for the petitioner has relied upon the authority of this Court passed in **CWP No. 13405 of 2015 titled as Ashok Kumar and others Vs. State of Punjab and another 2016 (3) SCT 1** and other connected cases wherein interest @ 9 % has been allowed to the employees of PRTC, w.e.f. three months after the date of retirement till the payment is actually made. The relevant extract of the aforesaid judgment is reproduced as under:-

- “3. Interest is available in the writ jurisdiction with the pronouncement of the judgment by the Full Bench in ***A.S. Randhawa Vs. State of Punjab and others, 1997 (3) SCT 468.***
4. *It is not disputed that in some of these cases, the full amounts have been paid and the claim is restricted to interest while in some others, the ascertainable amounts have yet to be paid while some of them stand discharged by the State.*
5. *Learned counsel relies on a decision involving the respondent-Corporation itself in a matter of award of interest for delayed payments of retiral benefits in which interest at the rate of 9% has been awarded for illegally withholding retiral benefits without any justification. There is no doubt that these petitions have to be allowed against the respondent in view of the decision of this Court relied on by Mr. Vikas Chatrath rendered in Bhawant Singh Vs. Pepsu Road Transport Coporation and others, 2015 (4) SCT 342 where the aforesaid 9 % interest was awarded on delayed payments. The onus to explain delay is on the Corporation and*

CWP No. 26520 of 2014 and other connected cases

they have been unable to discharge it to the satisfaction of the Court of the reasons which led to the delay and consequently directions to pay interest for the period of delay has become a valuable an accrued right.

6. *Accordingly, these petitions are allowed and the respondents are directed to pay interest @ 9% in CWPs 13405, 15234 and 15974 of 2015 while the respondents would calculate the delay in the remaining cases and award 9% interest on the period of delay on the amounts released and on the amounts yet to be released as they are still withheld. However, the interest would run with effect from three months after the date of superannuation in each of the cases till payment. The order be complied with within three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.”*

I am of the view that the employees are not to be blamed for the paucity of funds. Apparently, at some point of time, there must have been some mismanagement in the Corporation due to which PRTC is running in losses. The employees after their services are entitled to all of their pensionary benefits with immediate effect and a period of 3 months is considered to be reasonable for releasing the pensionary benefits. However, the respondent has expressed difficulty in releasing the payments.

In view of the matter, all the above noted petitions are allowed directing the respondent to release the pensionary benefits to the petitioners as early as possible but not later than 6 months. Further, the delayed payment shall carry 9% per annum interest which shall start running after three months from the date of retirement of the petitioners till the payment is actually made.

July 23, 2016
Suresh Kumar

[KULDIP SINGH]
JUDGE

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