Sanjiv Kumar Sharma
2017.06.01 13:39
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 12125 of 2017 (O/M)
Date of decision : 30.5.2017

Saroj Bala @ Saroj Rani ..... Petitioner (s)

Versus

Bank of India and another ..... Respondent (s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Dinesh Sharma, 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 learned counsel for the petitioner concedes that his case regarding ex-gratia in lieu of compassionate appointment is already allowed. Therefore, he does not seek re-assement of the case on ex-gratia payment. However, he states that the family pension, gratuity, enhanced provident fund, leave encashment and other benefits were to be released to the petitioner. The learned counsel for the petitioner seeks to withdraw the present writ petition to get information under the Right to Information Act, 2005, to find out whether the deceased husband of the petitioner had opted for the pension scheme and also obtain the information regarding gratuity, enhanced provident fund, leave encashment etc. and then file a fresh writ petition.

Dismissed as withdrawn with the aforesaid liberty.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

30.5.2017
sjks

Whether speaking / reasoned : Yes

Whether Reportable : No