

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

CWP No.9611 of 2017 (O&M)

Date of decision : May 05, 2017

Tarlok Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Dheeraj Mahajan, Advocate for the petitioner.

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 contends that despite his acquittal vide judgment dated 21.01.2016 passed by the learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Gurdaspur, the pensionary benefits are not being released to him. It is also contended that his representation dated 25.04.2016 (Annexure P-2) is pending with the respondents.

The short prayer made at this stage is to direct the respondents to decide the representation of the petitioner dated 25.04.2016 (Annexure P-2) in a time bound manner.

In these circumstance, without issuing notice to the respondents, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondents to take a decision on the representation of the petitioner dated 25.04.2016 (Annexure P-2) within two months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order by passing a speaking order.

**(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE**

May 05, 2017

sarita

Whether speaking / reasoned

Yes

Whether Reportable:

No