

101

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 13144 of 2016 (O/M)
Date of decision : 22.5.2017

Sukhdev Raj

..... Petitioner (s)

Versus

State of Punjab and others

..... Respondent (s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. R.S. Manhas, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Anshul Gupta, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.
Mr. R.S. Modi, Advocate, for respondents No. 4 and 5.

1. Whether the Reporters of local newspaper may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not.
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ?

-. -

-. -

KULDIP SINGH J. (ORAL)

The learned counsel for the petitioner states that the payments have been received. Now, he presses for interest on the delayed payment of Rs. 4,69,135/-, made on 8.11.2016. The petitioner retired from service on 31.3.2016. The payments were required to be made within three months.

The learned counsel for respondents No. 4 and 5 states that the payment of Rs. 7,83,403/- was made late on account of paucity of funds.

Whatever may be the reason, respondents No. 4 and 5 are now liable to pay 9% per annum interest on the said delayed payment of Rs. 4,69,135/-, made on 8.11.2016, starting from 1.7.2016 till the date of payment.

In view of the above, the present writ petition is disposed of.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

22.5.2017
sjks

Whether speaking / reasoned : Yes

Whether Reportable : No