

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

**CWP No.19987 of 2017
DECIDED ON: SEPTEMBER 05, 2017**

APNINDER SINGH

.....PETITIONER..

VERSUS

**PUNJAB STATE TRANSMISSION
CORPORATION LTD. AND OTHERS**

.....RESPONDENTS..

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH

Present: Mr. Brijesh Nandan, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

JASPAL SINGH, J. (ORAL)

Through 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 the respondents to grant the benefit of promotional increment(s) to the petitioner, on the doctrine of parity, in view of office orders dated 11.05.2015 and 12.06.2015 (P-5 to P-7) passed by respondent-corporation by which the benefit of 23 years promotional increment has already been granted to the similar situated employees, along with interest @ 18% per annum from the date, when it became due till realization.

2. At the very outset of the arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner feels satisfied in case direction is issued to respondent No.2 to decide legal notice dated 28.10.2016 (Annexure P-10),

within a stipulated period.

3. Accordingly, instant petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2-Additional Superintending Engineer, Punjab State Transmission Corporation Ltd., SAS Nagar Mohali, to look into the grievances unfolded by the petitioner in his legal notice dated 28.10.2016 (Annexure P-10) and decide the same, particularly keeping in view circular dated 23.04.1990 (Annexure P-1) and judgments passed by this Court in CWP No.20139 of 2015, titled as ***“Chiman Singh v. Punjab State Power Corporation Ltd. and ors.”*** decided on 29.02.2016 (Annexure P-8), CWP No.10689 of 2016, titled as ***“Gursharan Singh v. Punjab State Power Corporation Ltd. and ors”*** decided on 26.05.2016 (Annexure P-9), CWP No.17313 of 2017 (O&M), titled as ***“Kashmir Singh v. Punjab State Power Corporation Ltd. and others”*** decided on 08.08.2017 (Annexure P-11) as well as Services Rules and Instructions and notification issued by Govt. from time to time, by passing a speaking order, within a period of 3 months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

4. However, in case, the petitioner still feels aggrieved of the order passed by respondent No.2, he shall be at liberty to approach this Court.

SEPTEMBER 05, 2017
sonika

(JASPAL SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned ***Yes***

Whether reportable ***Yes/No***