

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.22189 of 2017
DECIDED ON: SEPTEMBER 27, 2017

AMRIK SINGH AND OTHERS

.....PETITIONERS.

VERSUS

PEPSU ROAD TRANSPORT CORP.
THROUGH ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR

.....RESPONDENT.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH

Present: Mr. Vikas Chatrath, 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 in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to count qualifying service for grant of revised pensionary benefits w.e.f. date of their joining the Corporation instead of date of contribution to provident fund and extending benefit of the law laid down in CWP No. 8285 of 2004, “*Ved Parkash v. State of Punjab and others*” on 16.09.2010 (Annexure P-2), wherein LPA No. 207 of 2011, “*PRTC vs. Ved Parkash and another*” was dismissed on 03.02.2011 (Annexure P-3) while SLP filed by PRTC was dismissed on 12.01.2012 and in view of judgment rendered in CWP No. 4453 of 2012, “*Gurdial Singh and others v. PRTC and another*”, decided on 12.03.2012 (Annexure P-4) which has been implemented vide vide

affidavit dated 04.02.2013 (Annexure P-5).

2. At the very outset, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners feel satisfied in case direction is issued to respondent(s) to decide the legal notice dated 05.06.2017 (Annexure P-6) within a stipulated period.

3. Accordingly, instant petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent(s) to look into the grievances unfolded by the petitioners in their legal notice dated 05.06.2017 (Annexure P-6) and to decide the same, in the light of CWP No. 8285 of 2004, titled as “***Ved Parkash v. State of Punjab and others***” on 16.09.2010 (Annexure P-2) and CWP No. 4453 of 2012, “***Gurdial Singh and others v. PRTC and another***”, decided on 12.03.2012 (Annexure P-4), which as per the version of learned counsel for the petitioners has already stood implemented, within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

4. However, if the petitioners still feel aggrieved of the order passed by the concerned authority, they shall be at liberty to approach this Court.

SEPTEMBER 27, 2017
sonika

(JASPAL SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned ***Yes***

Whether reportable ***Yes/No***