

Prince Saini
2017.08.31 18:44
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document
Chandigarh

involved herein is also of the like nature as was considered in CR No.4676 of 2017 as well as in CR No.5191 of 2017 decided on 11.08.2017.

Since the matter has been remanded to the District Judge, Sangrur with a direction to either keep the case or mark the same to other officer for fresh decision in accordance with law, therefore, keeping this case in isolation would not serve any *bona fide* purpose. The controversy relates to payment of solatium and interest on enhanced amount of compensation. The controversy needs to be answered with reference to ratio laid down in **State of Punjab Vs. Amarjit Singh and another, 2012(4) RCR (Civil) 358, Gurpreet Singh Vs. Union of India, 2008(2) RCR (Civil) 207** and **Sunder Vs. Union of India, 2001(4) RCR (Civil) 727.**

The adjudication of the issue at the first instance from the Court of District Judge was thought appropriate by the Co-ordinate Bench while remanding the case to the Court. There cannot be any exception to the aforesaid procedure evolved in the connected matter.

In view of above, this case is also remanded to the District Judge, Sangrur with a direction to either keep the case file or mark the same to some other officer for fresh decision in accordance with law within a period of three months from the

date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

This petition is accordingly disposed of.

August 29, 2017.

Prince

Whether speaking/reasoned

Whether reportable

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Yes/No

Yes/No