

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Sr. No.: 252

CWP No.18796 of 2015

Date of Decision: August 09, 2017

SATPAL MAINI

..... PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

..... RESPONDENTS

CORAM HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH

PRESENT: Mr. Puneet Kumar Bansal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Devaki Anand Sullar, Assistant Advocate General,
Punjab.

None for the respondent No.4.

. . .

Jaspal Singh, J

By virtue of this civil writ petition, preferred under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, petitioner has sought issuance of a writ in the nature of Mandamus, directing the respondents to pay interest @ 18% per annum on delayed payment of retiral benefits.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that interest on delayed payment has not been awarded to which the petitioner is legally entitled.

3. A writ in the nature of mandamus is legally maintainable for giving a direction to make the payment where it is justified in view of judgment delivered in ***A.S. Randhawa vs. State of Punjab & others, 1997 (3) SCT 468*** as well as ***Vijay L. Mehrotra vs. State of U.P., 2000(4) SCT 267***. Gist of aforesaid judgment in the case of ***A.S. Randhawa (supra)*** is that a writ for direction to pay retiral benefits including interest is maintainable and that pensionary benefits, if released after a delay, entitles the incumbent to interest at the rate of 12%, which may even go upto 18% per annum. In case ***Vijay L. Mehrotra (supra)***, the Hon'ble Apex Court, while considering the appeal only on the question of grant of interest on the delayed payment of retiral dues, has observed that in case of delay of payment, interest has to be paid on the delayed payment of retiral dues, in case there is no reason or justification for not making payment. It observed:

“3. In case of an employee retiring after having rendered service, it is expected that all the payment of the retiral benefits should be paid on the date of retirement or soon thereafter if for some unforeseen circumstances the payments could not be made on the date of retirement.

4. In this case, there is absolutely no reason or justification for not making the payments for months together. We, therefore, direct the respondent to pay to the appellant within 12 weeks from today simple interest at the rate of 18 per cent with effect from the date of her retirement, i.e. 31-8-1997 till the date of payments.”

4. Similarly, in case ***Ex. Capt. R.S. Dhull vs. State of Haryana, 1998(2) SCT 729***, the Hon'ble Supreme Court observed that the retiree is entitled to interest @ 12% per annum on the withheld GP Fund and Gratuity

etc. from the date the same became payable to him on his attaining the age of superannuation till the date the payment is made to him.

5. Adverting to the facts of the case, petitioner joined office of respondent No.4 – Municipal Council, Guru Harsahai, Punjab on August 19, 1981 as Clerk on regular basis. On June 30, 2012, he retired from the post of Junior Assistant after taking pre-mature retirement. However, complete retiral benefits were paid to the petitioner on July 15, 2015 i.e. after period of more than three years from the date of his retirement without any fault on his part. It is a settled principle that grant of interest on the delayed payment is on account of the fact that retiree was unable to enjoy its fruits immediately on his retirement and then a right accrues to him to be compensated and the only way to compensate him is to pay interest for the period of delayed payment. Now, a question arises as to the period in which the retiral benefits should be disbursed to the retiree/family of deceased employee.

6. In case *A.S. Randhawa (supra)*, the Full Bench of this Court observed that a Government employee on his retirement becomes immediately entitled to pension and other benefits in terms of the Pension Rules, a duty is simultaneously cast on the State to ensure the disbursement of pension and other benefits to the retiree in proper time.

7. It is also well settled that proper time for the disbursement of retiral benefits will depend on the facts and circumstances of each case but normally it would not exceed three months from the date of retirement which time limit has been laid down by the Apex Court in *State of Kerala vs. M. Padmanabhan, AIR 1985 SC 356; D.D. Tewari (D) through LRs vs. Uttar Haryana Bijli Nitran Nigam Ltd., 2014(4) S.C.T. 128; A.S.*

Randhawa vs. State of Punjab (supra); J.S. Cheema vs. State of Haryana & others, 2014(3) RCR (Civil) 355; and Manohar Lal vs. State of Punjab & others, 2016(4) SCT 250 as well as judgment of Madhya Pradesh High Court in case ***Sudha Chhipa & others vs. State of M.P. & others, 2014 LIC 2125***. While following the Full Bench decision in the case of ***A.S. Randhawa (supra)***, this Court in ***Amarjit Kaur vs. State of Punjab & others, 2011(1) Service Cases Today 85***, where there was delay of 16 years in payment of retiral benefits, has awarded interest @ 18% per annum on the delayed payment.

8. Undoubtedly, petitioner stood retired on June 30, 2012 and complete payment of retiral dues was sanctioned on July 15, 2015. From the reply, it is evident that benefit of arrears of pension for the period from July 01, 2012 to August 31, 2015 amounting to Rs.28,212/- were paid whereas commuted pension amounting to Rs.3,46,624/- was deposited in the petitioner's bank account vide Memo. No.DDLG-Pen-13/4582 dated April 23, 2013. At the most, respondents could have taken a period of three months from the date of retirement during which, payment of retiral benefits should have been disbursed to the petitioner.

9. Taking into consideration the facts & circumstances of the case in hand, this Court is of the view that grant of interest @ 9% per annum, on the delayed payment after expiry of three months from the date of retirement till the payment, is legally and factually justified. Accordingly, this Court awards an interest @ 9% per annum on the delayed payment(s) w.e.f. October 01, 2012 to actual date of payments on each particular retiral benefits, shall be paid to the petitioner by the respondent No.4-Municipal Council, Guru Harsahai after calculating the same within a period of three

months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this judgment. In case of non-compliance of this order, petitioner shall be at liberty to approach this Court.

9. Disposed of accordingly.

August 09, 2017
Avin/Ankur

(JASPAL SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No