

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 20769 OF 2017
DECIDED ON: SEPTEMBER 13, 2017

JASBIR KAUR

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH

Present: Mr. Sunny Singla, Advocate
for the petitioners.

JASPAL SINGH, J (ORAL)

By virtue of instant petition preferred under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, petitioners have sought issuance of a writ especially in the nature of mandamus, directing the respondent to release the pension and other retiral benefits to the petitioner in terms of decision dated 31.08.2010 passed by the Division Bench in CWP No. 2371 of 2010, "*Harbans Lal v. State of Punjab and others*" (Annexure P-6).

2. At the very outset of the arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that though legal notice dated 08.08.2017 (Annexure P-9) was duly served upon the respondents but till date no action has been taken. He further submits that petitioner feels satisfied in case direction is issued to respondent(s) to decide the legal notice in terms of *Harbans Lal's case* (supra), which has attained finality as SLP filed challenging the order before the Hon'ble

Apex Court has since been dismissed.

3. Without commenting upon the merits of the case and considering the other aspects projected by the learned counsel for the petitioner, instant petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.3-Senior Superintendent of Police, Bathinda to look into the grievances unfolded by the petitioner in her legal notice dated 08.08.2017 (Annexure P-9) and to decide the same, in accordance with law, service rules and instructions issued from time to time as well as in the light of *Harbans Lal's case (supra)* (Annexure P-6) as well as subsequent judgment passed on the basis thereof in CWP No. 7624 of 2016, captioned as “*Dalbir Singh and others v. State of Punjab and others*”, decided on 05.05.2016 (Annexure P-11), within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

4. However, if the petitioner still feels aggrieved against the order passed by the concerned authority, she shall be at liberty to approach this Court.

SEPTEMBER 13, 2017
sonika

(JASPAL SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned *Yes*

Whether reportable *Yes/No*