

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

**CWP No.26735 of 2015
Decided on : 28.01.2016**

Harjit Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab & others

... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE G.S. SANDHAWALIA

Present : Mr.Sunny Singla, Advocate, for the petitioner.

G.S. Sandhawalia , J. (Oral)

The petitioner seeks the relief of counting of the ad hoc services rendered by his wife, for the purposes of qualifying service, for grant of pensionary benefits and for the payment of the consequential benefits, along with interest. The relief is claimed on the basis of the directions issued by this Court in CWP-3770-2012 titled *Ude Singh & others Vs. State of Punjab & another*, decided on 29.02.2012. Reliance is also placed upon the instructions dated 14.06.2013 (Annexure P7) issued by the respondent-Board, wherein the said benefit is to be granted.

It is the pleaded case of the petitioner that the wife of the petitioner had rendered ad hoc service from 15.01.1987 till 11.11.1992 and was regularized on 12.11.1992. She retired on 31.08.2012 and unfortunately, expired within a period of one year of retirement, on 22.06.2013.

Counsel for the petitioner submits that representations dated 27.08.2013 and 04.05.2015 (Annexures P11 & 12, respectively) have already been made but no action has been taken on the same and he would be satisfied if the same is decided within a time-bound frame.

Keeping in view the limited controversy involved, this Court does not feel it necessary to call upon the respondents to file reply.

Accordingly, without commenting upon the merits of the case, the present writ petition is disposed of, with a direction to respondent No.1, to look into the issue and take appropriate action on the representations (Annexures P11 & 12), within a period of 3 months from the receipt of a certified copy of this order. In case the petitioner is found entitled for the same, the monetary benefits be paid to him, within a period of 2 months, thereafter. The petitioner's entitlement for payment of interest on the delayed payment will also be taken into consideration, while deciding the representations. In case the amount is to be denied, a reasoned order be passed and the same be conveyed to the petitioner.

JANUARY 28, 2016
sailesh

(G.S. SANDHAWALIA)
JUDGE