

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP No.15630 of 2017 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 19.07.2017

Shri Bhagwan Ram & others

--Petitioners

Versus

Punjab State Power Corporation Ltd. and others

--Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.

Present:- Mr. Karan Bhardwaj, Advocate for the petitioners.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.J

The petitioners, who are serving on different posts in the nature of Sub Station Attendants, Line Man and Junior Engineer under the P.S.P.C.L, have filed the instant petition being aggrieved of having been denied the benefit of promotional increment on completion of 23 years of service.

It is the contention raised by counsel that other employees of the respondent Corporation had raised an identical grievance in terms of filing CWP No.17453 of 2016 and which was disposed of on 27.8.2016 in the following terms:-

“Prayer in the instant writ petition on behalf of the petitioners, is for grant of the benefit of the promotional increment on completion of twenty-three (23) years' regular service as they have not got even a second promotion, much less three promotion, that too between the 16th and 23rd years of service.

Five petitioners, namely, Amrik Singh, Faqir Chand, Paramjit Singh, Surjit Singh and Sudesh Kumar (petitioner Nos. 1 to 5, respectively), were recruited as Assistant Lineman with the erstwhile Punjab State Electricity Board (succeeding by Punjab State Power Corporation Ltd.). The petitioners are stated to have earned one promotion to the

rank of Lineman. Faqir Chand and Surjit Singh (petitioner Nos. 2 & 4, respectively) are stated to have retired w.e.f. 31.12.2013 and 28.02.2014, respectively, whereas remaining three petitioners, namely, Amrik Singh, Paramjit Singh and Sudesh Kumar (petitioner Nos. 1, 3 & 5, respectively) are still working as Lineman with the Punjab State Power Corporation Ltd.

*At the time of hearing, learned counsel for the petitioners, submits that his clients would be satisfied if the respondents are directed to decide their claim as set out in the legal notice dated 23.05.2016 (**Annexure P-4**) within a time frame.*

The prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioners, being reasonable, is accepted.

*In view of above, the instant writ petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondents to look into the matter, consider the claim/grievance of the petitioners raised vide legal notice dated 23.05.2016 (**Annexure P-4**) and decide the same at an early date, by passing a speaking order thereon, strictly in accordance with law, but in any case within a period of four months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order. Needless to say that admissible benefits shall be released to the petitioners within the period of one month thereafter.*

Disposed of in the above terms.”

Counsel contends that the present petitioners are at par with the petitioners in CWP No.17453 of 2016.

The instant petition is, accordingly, disposed of in terms of issuing directions to respondents no.1 to 3 to consider the claim of the petitioners in the light of taking a final decision on a legal notice dated 18.4.2017 (Annexure P-5) i.e. stated to have already been served.

Let a final decision thereupon be taken within a period of four months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order and be conveyed to the petitioners.

Disposed of.

(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE

19.07.2017

lucky

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable:	Yes/No