

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

CWP No.10915 of 2017 (O&M)

Date of decision : May 19, 2017

S.P.S. Patheja

..... Petitioner

Versus

Union of India and others

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Navdeep Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

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 claim of the petitioner is that a corrigendum PPO was issued on 07.10.1987 to the Treasury Officer, U.T., Chandigarh. However, the same was not received by the Treasury Officer, Central Treasury, Chandigarh. Now, correspondence between respondent Nos.1 and 3 is going on but the corrigendum PPO is not being issued. It is stated that earlier the pension of the petitioner was not effected, but from the year 2006 onward, is being effected for want of corrigendum PPO. The petitioner has already made representation dated 14.04.2016 (Annexure P-1) to respondent No.1.

Short prayer made at this stage is to direct the respondents to decide the representation of the petitioner dated 14.04.2016 (Annexure P-1) in a time bound manner.

In these circumstances, without issuing notice to the respondents, the present petition is disposed of with direction to the petitioner to first make the representation before respondent Nos.2 and 3,

thereafter, respondent Nos.2 and 3 shall consider and decide the same within one months from the date of receipt of the representation by passing a speaking order, in case, they decide not to issue the corrigendum PPO.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

May 19, 2017

sarita

Whether speaking / reasoned Yes

Whether Reportable: No