

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

Sr.No.124

CWP-8092-2016

Decided on : 29.04.2016

Sukhdev Singh

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL

Present: Mr.Fateh Saini, Advocate, for the petitioner.

DEEPAK SIBAL, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner has filed the present petition with the following prayers: -

- (a) *a writ in nature of mandamus directing the respondents to pay an interest @ 18% P.A. on the delay payments of arrear/dues of Rs.13,55,805/- (arrear from 11.08.2003 to 31.10.2015), which is credited in the account of petitioner in November 2015, for no fault of him.*
- (b) *a writ in nature of mandamus directing the respondents to add/allow the handicapped allowance/benefit to the petitioner w.e.f. 11.03.2003 on the account of the fact that his right leg had to be amputated in the road accident during his service on 11.11.2002, and said benefit is admissible to handicapped employees in the State of Haryana, which is withheld illegally, malafidely and arbitrarily by the*

respondents for the reasons best known to them.

Learned counsel for the petitioner does not press the first prayer.

So far as the second prayer is concerned, since qua the same, before coming to the Court, no representation had been made by the petitioner before the respondents, counsel for the petitioner prays for and is granted liberty to withdraw the present petition with liberty to the petitioner to first approach the respondents qua this prayer through a comprehensive representation.

Dismissed as withdrawn with liberty as prayed for.

If any representation the liberty of which has been sought and got is made, the same shall be decided by the competent authority by passing a speaking order and after affording opportunity of hearing to the petitioner, preferably within four months from the date of receipt of such representation.

Needless to add that the decision so taken be communicated to the petitioner and if the decision is not to the satisfaction of the petitioner, he would be at liberty to challenge the same, in accordance with law.

29.04.2016
shamsher

[DEEPAK SIBAL]
JUDGE