

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.22243 of 2017
DECIDED ON: SEPTEMBER 28, 2017

RAM LAL

.....PETITIONER.

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

.....RESPONDENTS.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH

Present: Mr. Harchand Singh Batth, 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 the respondents to release the retiral benefits, including commuted pension, pension and amount of gratuity for a sum of ₹8,47,926/- along with interest @ 18% from due date i.e. 01.11.2016.

2. At the very outset, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that though legal notice dated 17.08.2017 (Annexure P-7) was duly served upon the respondent(s) but till date no conscious decision has been taken. He further submits that petitioner feels satisfied in case direction is issued to respondent(s) to decide the aforesaid legal notice, within a stipulated period.

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

respondent(s) to consider the claim(s) of the petitioner unfolded in his legal notice dated 17.08.2017 (Annexure P-7) and to decide the same, within a period of two months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. In case, the concerned authority comes to the conclusion that petitioner is entitled to the relief claimed through aforesaid legal notice, to release/disburse the same within a period of next one month. The factum of grant of interest be also considered in view of the observations made by Full Bench of this Court in case captioned as ***“R.S. Randhawa vs. State of Punjab, 1997 (3) RSJ 318.***

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

SEPTEMBER 28, 2017,
sonika

(JASPAL SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned ***Yes***

Whether reportable ***Yes/No***