

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA, CHANDIGARH
Sr. No.: 235/A

Civil Writ Petition No.9447 of 2015 (O & M)
Date of Decision: July 11, 2017

Ramesh Kumar

..... PETITIONER

VERSUS

State of Punjab & others

..... RESPONDENTS

. . .

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

. . .

PRESENT: - Mr. Surinder Garg, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Ms. Sudeepti Sharma, Additional Advocate General,
Punjab.

Mr. B.S. Sidhu, Advocate, for respondent No.4.

. . .

Jaspal Singh, J

1. By virtue of this civil writ 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 pay all the retiral benefits to him. Further prayer is that petitioner is entitled to interest @ 18% per annum on the delayed payment of all the pending retiral benefits.

2. At the very outset of arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner has stated at bar that retiral benefits have been released to the petitioner.

3. Accordingly, the writ petition has rendered infructuous, in as

much as, grant of retiral benefits is concerned. Now a question arises as to

Avin Kumar
2017.07.19 15:26
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

the period in which the retiral benefits should be disbursed to the retiree, especially to see whether the petitioner is entitled for payment of interest on delayed payment?

4. As regards grant of interest on delayed payment of retiral benefits, the matter in controversy has been dealt by this Court in case **Charan Dass vs. State of Punjab & others**, CWP No.8772 of 2015, decided on July 11, 2017, wherein while, referring to judgment rendered by this Court in **Amarjit Kaur vs. State of Punjab & others**, 2011(1) **Service Cases Today** 85; Full Bench of this Court in **A.S. Randhawa vs. State of Punjab & others**, 1997(3) **SCT** 468 as well as decisions rendered by Hon'ble Apex Court in **Vijay L. Mehrotra vs. State of U.P.**, 2000(4) **SCT** 267; **Ex. Capt. R.S. Dhull vs. State of Haryana**, 1998(2) **SCT** 729; **State of Kerala vs. M. Padmanabhan**, AIR 1985 SC 356; **D.D. Tewari (D) through LRs vs. Uttar Haryana Bijli Nitran Nigam Ltd.**, 2014(4) **S.C.T.** 128; **J.S. Cheema vs. State of Haryana & others**, 2014(3) **RCR (Civil)** 355; and **Manohar Lal vs. State of Punjab & others**, 2016(4) **SCT** 250 as well as judgment of Madhya Pradesh High Court in case **Sudha Chhipa & others vs. State of M.P. & others**, 2014 **LIC** 2125, has observed as under:-

“At the most, the respondents could have taken a period of three months from the date of retirement during which the payment of retiral benefits should have been disbursed to the petitioner. In the aforesaid cases, the rate of interest to be paid on delayed payment has been held to be reasonable to the tune of 12% per annum which may even go up to 18% in certain cases. Taking into consideration the facts & circumstances of the case in hand, this Court is of the view that grant of interest @ 12% per annum, on the delayed payment after expiry of three months from the date of retirement of petitioner till the payment, is legally and factually justified. Accordingly, this Court awards an interest @ 12% per annum on the delayed payment w.e.f. April 01, 2014 to actual date of payment i.e. June 03, 2016, which shall be paid by the respondents after calculating the same within

a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this judgment.”

6. Undoubtedly, Petitioner, in this case, superannuated on December 31, 2014. Taking into consideration the facts & circumstances of the case in hand and following the dictum of above referred authoritative judgments, this Court is of the considered view that grant of interest @ 12% per annum, on the delayed payment after expiry of three months from the date of retirement of petitioner till its actual payment, is legally and factually justified. This Court awards an interest @ 12% per annum on the delayed payment w.e.f. April 01, 2015 to actual date of payment which shall be paid by the respondent(s) after calculating the same within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this judgment.

July 11, 2017
avin

(Jaspal Singh)
Judge

Whether Speaking/ Reasoned:
Whether Reportable:

Yes/ No
Yes/ No