

CWP-21007-2017

Date of Decision : 15.09.2017

Sharda Devi

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab and others

....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH**Present:** Mr. Peeush Gagneja, Advocate
for the petitioner.**JASPAL SINGH, JUDGE (ORAL)**

Contention of learned counsel for the petitioner is that husband of the petitioner namely, Raj Kumar died on June 7, 2013, while in service. Though some benefits have been released/disbursed to the petitioner being the widow of Raj Kumar, that too in pursuance of the order dated February 19, 2014 passed by this Court in earlier CWP No.2797 of 2014 preferred by the petitioner, yet the entire amount to which the petitioner is legally entitled, has not been released/disbursed to her. Even the wrong calculation is also there on account of the dearness allowance which has also resulted into peculiar the loss to the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the petitioner further contends that the legal notice dated March 31, 2017 (Annexure P-4) has also been served upon the respondents including the Executive Officer Municipal Committee, Fazilka but till date neither any response has been received nor any conscious decision has been taken by the concerned authority.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner feels satisfied in case a direction is issued to respondent No.3 to look into the grievances unfolded by her in legal notice (Annexure P-4) and take a conscious decision thereon.

Without expressing anything on merits and various averments made in the legal notice, the instant petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.3 to look into the grievances unfolded by the petitioner in legal notice (Annexure P-4) and take a conscious decision in accordance with law as well as service rules within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order by passing a speaking order.

In case, respondent No.3 comes to the conclusion that petitioner is entitled to service benefits claimed through legal notice as well as interest, in terms of judgments rendered by this Court in *A.S. Randhawa versus State of Punjab and others* 1997 (3) SCT 468 and judgment dated August 23, 2017 passed in CWP No.19179 of 2016 titled *Professor Charanjit Singh Dhillon versus State of Punjab and others* payment thereof, be made to the petitioner within a period of one month thereafter.

If the petitioner still feels aggrieved, he shall be at liberty to approach this Court.

(JASPAL SINGH)
JUDGE

15.09.2017
Neha

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No