

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

Sr. No.124

Civil Writ Petition No.17960 of 2017
DECIDED ON: August 11, 2017

SHEELA

...PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH

Present: Mr. R.S. Mamli, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

JASPAL SINGH, J. (ORAL)

By virtue of instant petition preferred under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, petitioner has sought the issuance of a writ particularly in any nature of mandamus/certiorari directing the respondents to pay the retiral/death benefits of the husband of the petitioner namely Hawa Singh, Helper, Class IV employee, Health Services, Panipat along with medical bills and other benefits due to the respondents with interest.

2. At the very outset of the arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that husband of the petitioner namely Hawa Singh was working Class IV employee in the Health Department who breathed his last on June 07, 2011 but he was due to retire in the month of January, 2016. Though, the respondents have paid salary but no other benefit has been

Civil Writ Petition No.17960 of 2017

released/disbursed to the petitioner, to which, she is legally entitled. Even, a representation dated July 24, 2017 (Annexure P-4) was also moved to respondent No.2 but till date neither any benefits have been released/disbursed to the petitioner nor representation did fetch any reply.

3. Taking into consideration the aforesaid aspects, instant petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2-The Director General, Health Services, Sector 6, Panchkula (Haryana) to look into the grievances unfolded by the petitioner in her representation dated July 24, 2017 (Annexure P-4) and take a conscious decision by passing a speaking order that too, after giving a patience hearing to the petitioner within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. In case, respondent No.2 comes to the conclusion that petitioner is entitled to the relief(s) claimed, same be released to her within a period of next 45 days. Factum of interest in view of judgment in case *A.S. Randhawa vs. State of Punjab & Ors., 1997 (3) SCT 468* be also considered on delayed payment(s).

4. However, if petitioner still feels aggrieved by any order of the afore-said authority, she shall be at liberty to approach this Court.

August 11, 2017
Ankur

(JASPAL SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No