

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

105

**CWP No.11720 of 2017 (O&M)
Date of Decision: July 18, 2017**

Rajiv Attal

....Petitioner

vs.

Punjab State Power Corporation Ltd. and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA

Present: Mr. Saravpreet Gurna, Advocate
for the petitioner.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA, J. (Oral)

The petitioner is serving on the post of Revenue Accountant under the Punjab State Power Corporation Limited.

The instant writ petition has been filed seeking the issuance of a writ of mandamus for directing the respondent-Corporation to release in his favour the training incentive/honorarium under the National Training Policy For The Power Sector adopted by the Corporation in the year 2007 in lieu of the petitioner having trained other employees towards a induction module and other departmental trainings for the period 2005 to 2016.

Counsel for the petitioner has been heard at length.

The claim essentially raised in the present writ petition is a money claim. That apart, the writ petition throws up certain disputed questions of fact. To examine and adjudicate on the claim

raised by the petitioner, it would be necessary to look into certain relevant evidence in the nature of duty hours of the petitioner on his substantive post of Revenue Accountant as opposed to the duty hours that the petitioner had dedicated for imparting training to other employees as has been averred in the petition. There is no document placed on record which would substantiate beyond any doubt that the petitioner had been assigned and appointed for such training and against which the release of training incentive and honorarium is being claimed. That would also be an issue which would require evidence to be led and to be duly proved.

In view of the above, while declining to interfere in the instant petition, petitioner is relegated to avail of his civil remedy, if so advised.

It is however made clear that while granting such liberty to the petitioner as regards availing of his alternate civil remedy, this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the claim/prayers, raised in the petition.

Petition is disposed of accordingly.

(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE

18.07.2017
anju rani

Whether speaking/reasoned : **Yes/No**
Whether reportable : **Yes/No**