

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

CWP No. 3557 of 2016
Date of decision: 23.02.2016

Surinder Pal Sharma and others

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondent(s)

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

Present: Mr. V.K. Shukla, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

G.S.SANDHAWALIA, J. (Oral)

The petitioners seek monetary benefits on account of officiating on the said posts alongwith arrears and interest. As per the case of the petitioners, they were officiating as District Treasury Officers and, therefore, are claiming the higher pay scale.

It is not disputed that in the case of petitioner no. 1, he was officiating from 01.01.2003 to 24.06.2005 whereas in the case of petitioner no. 2 from 23.06.1999 to 14.07.2003. Similarly also for the other petitioners, the officiating period is mainly hit by the bar of limitation.

Nothing has been shown to this Court that the petitioners, during their service period, had even represented for the said claim. Merely filing of a legal notice on 02.11.2015 (Annexure P-7) would not entitle them for revival of a stale claim for which they have never agitated during the period of service. Rather, even the dates of retirement have not been mentioned in the writ petition.

In such circumstances, this Court is of the opinion that bar of limitation stares them in the face. This Court in *CWP No. 1114 of 2016, Mohan Singh and another vs. State of Punjab and another* decided on 27.01.2016, in similar circumstances where claim had been made after a decade of work on the post, dismissed the writ petition. The present case is also squarely covered by the observations made in the said case.

Accordingly, the present writ petition is dismissed.

23.02.2016
shivani

(G.S. SANDHAWALIA)
JUDGE