

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 28377 OF 2017
DECIDED ON: DECEMBER 13, 2017

DHARAMPAL SINGH

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.

.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH

Present: Mr. Sunil Kumar Bhardwaj, Advocate
for the petitioner.

JASPAL SINGH, J.

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 certiorari for quashing impugned action of the respondents in not calculating the service rendered by the petitioner in CONFED as qualifying service for the purpose of retirement benefits/pension etc. further not taking any action over the application (P-5). And further for issuance of direction to respondent No.2 to calculate the service rendered by the petitioner in CONFED for the purpose of qualifying service for retirement benefits/pension etc. as per the judgments (P-8) alongwith all other consequential benefits with interest.

2. At the very outset of the arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that though application/representation dated 10.05.2017 (Annexure P-5) was moved to the respondents but till date neither any benefit

has been released nor any response has been received. He further submits that petitioner feels satisfied in case direction is issued to respondent No.2 decide aforesaid application/representation, within a stipulated period.

3. Instant petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2- Director, Department of Food, Civil Supplies and Consumer Affairs, Chandigarh to consider the claim of petitioner and decide the same as per Rules, Regulations and Instructions issued by Govt. from time to time as well as in the light of observations made by this Court in LPA No.1805-2016 (O&M), titled as ***“Haryana State Agricultural Marketing Board and another v. Prem Parkash Gupta and ors”*** decided on 05.10.2016 (Annexure P-6), within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

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

DECEMBER 13, 2017
sonika

(JASPAL SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned ***Yes***

Whether reportable ***Yes/No***