

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.19044 of 2017
DECIDED ON: August 24, 2017

RAJBIR SINGH

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH

Present: Mr. Naveen Singh Panwar, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

JASPAL SINGH, J (ORAL)

By virtue of instant petition preferred under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, petitioner has sought issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus, directing respondent No.2 to release leave encashment, gratuity and other benefits of the petitioner.

2. The contention of learned counsel for the petitioner is that the petitioner stood retired on 30.06.2017 as a Manager on attaining the age of superannuation but till date the retiral benefits have not been released/disbursed to him. Even, a representation dated 14.07.2017 (Annexure P-2) was also moved to Manager, Sonipat Co-operative Marketing Society Ltd, Sonipat but till date neither any reply has been received nor any action has been taken.

3. Accordingly, instant petition is disposed of with the direction to

respondent(s) to look into the grievances unfolded by the petitioner in his representation dated 14.07.2017 (Annexure P-2) and decide the same in accordance with law, within a period of 3 months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. In case, the concerned authorities come to the conclusion that petitioner is entitled to the relief claimed, to release/disburse the same within a period of next 45 days. The matter with regard to grant of interest on delayed payment be also considered in view of the observations made by Full Bench of this Court in case captioned as “*A.S. Randhawa vs. State of Punjab and others, 1997 (3) SCT 468.*”

However, in case, the petitioner still feels aggrieved against the order passed by respondent(s), he shall be at liberty to approach this Court.

August 24, 2017
sonika

(JASPAL SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned *Yes*

Whether reportable *Yes/No*