

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

LPA No. 977 of 2013 (O&M)

DATE OF DECISION : 07.01.2016

State of Punjab

.... APPELLANT

Versus

Updesh Kaur and others

.... RESPONDENTS

CORAM :- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SATISH KUMAR MITTAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARINDER SINGH SIDHU

Present : Mr. B.S. Chahal, Advocate,
for the appellant.

Mr. Puneet Gupta, Advocate,
for respondents No.1 to 3.

* * *

SATISH KUMAR MITTAL, J. (Oral)

This intra-court appeal under Clause X of the Letters Patent has been filed against the order dated 21.05.2012 passed by the learned Single Judge, allowing the writ petition (CWP No. 7078 of 2002) filed by Kanwaljit Singh Bakshi, who died during the pendency of the writ petition. The legal heirs of the deceased employee (respondents No.1 to 3 herein) were held entitled to full salary till the date of his death, as well as the family pension.

Learned counsel for the applicant states that the direction with regard to grant of full salary to the legal heirs of the deceased employee till the date of his death has been complied with. He further states that with

regard to family pension to the legal heirs of the deceased employee, the case has been referred to the authorities and the decision in that regard will be taken expeditiously, preferably within a period of one month. In view of this position, learned counsel for the applicant, after having instructions from Shri Sukhcharan Singh, Superintendent Judicial I, Department of House Affairs and Justice, Punjab, who is present in the court, states that he does not want to press this appeal.

Learned counsel for respondents No.1 to 3 has pointed out that vide order dated 09.07.2013, this court had directed the appellant to deposit a sum of ₹ 25,000/- in the shape of a demand draft in favour of respondents No.1 to 3, towards litigation expenses. On the next date of hearing, i.e. on 25.09.2013, a bankers cheque in the sum of ₹ 25,000/- in favour of respondent No.1 was handed over to learned counsel for respondents No.1 to 3, which is still in his possession. However, due to expiry of time, the cheque cannot be encashed. Therefore, learned counsel for respondents No.1 to 3 has handed over the said cheque to learned counsel for the appellant, who ensures that the amount of ₹ 25,000/- will be paid to respondents No.1 to 3 within a reasonable time.

Dismissed as not pressed.

(SATISH KUMAR MITTAL)
JUDGE

January 07, 2016
ndj

(HARINDER SINGH SIDHU)
JUDGE