

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

CWP No. 26221 of 2016
Date of Decision: 22.02.2017

RAMESH CHAND GUPTA

... Petitioner

VS.

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

...Respondents

CORAM: **HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH.**

Present: Mr. J.L. Goyal, Advocate,
 for the petitioner.

KULDIP SINGH, J (ORAL)

The petitioner has preferred this writ petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing the order dated 14.03.2016 (*Annexure P-6*) vide which the respondent department has rejected the claim of the petitioner for the payment of Leave Travel Concession (LTC).

Brief facts of this case are that the petitioner retired as Clerk on 31.03.2012. He claims for the LTC for the block year 2012-2015 in terms of policy dated 18.05.2009 (*Annexure P-1*). The LTC for the said block year had started from 01.01.2012 and the petitioner retired on 31.03.2012. The impugned order dated 14.03.2016 (*Annexure P-6*) shows that the petitioner had applied for LTC only on 27.05.2013 i.e. after a period of more than one year after his retirement.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has taken the plea that in terms of instructions dated 11.11.2011, the petitioner was to be informed about the said policy (*Annexure P-1*).

I am of the view that the facility of LTC is usually within the notice of all the employees. It is not the case of the petitioner that earlier he

CWP No. 26221 of 2016

had not availed LTC. When the LTC is available from 01.01.2012, and the petitioner knew the same, he never availed the same during the service till his retirement and applied only after one year of his retirement. Therefore, there is no illegality and infirmity in the impugned order dated 14.03.2016 (Annexure P-6).

In view of the above, the present writ petition stands dismissed.

February 22, 2017
Suresh Kumar

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking / reasoned	:	✓ Yes / No ✓
Whether Reportable	:	Yes / No