

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

CWP No.4684 of 2015 (O&M)

Date of decision : April 17, 2017

Harmesh Chand @ Ramesh Chand

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Rajesh Verma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Anshul Gupta, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. H.K. Aurora, Advocate for respondent No.3.

1. Whether the Reporters of local newspaper may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not.
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ?

KULDIP SINGH J. (ORAL)

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that the petitioner had visited the office of the respondent and checked the accounts but unable to understand them.

However, on behalf of the respondents, stand has been taken that all the payments have been made and the details thereof have been sent to the petitioner. Therefore, nothing is due from the respondents.

In view of the matter, the present petition is disposed of as satisfied with liberty to the petitioner that if he points out any shortage to the respondents, the respondents shall consider the same and if it is found to be correct, the same be paid to the petitioner.

For the delayed payment of pension amounting to ₹406895/-, which was released to the petitioner by way of cheque No.347903 on 12.01.2016, he shall be entitled to interest @ 9% per annum starting three months from the date of retirement till its payment by respondent No.3.

**(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE**

April 17, 2017

sarita

Whether speaking / reasoned

Yes

Whether Reportable:

No