

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

201

RSA No.317 of 2012 (O&M)

Date of Decision : 21.09.2017

Jagrup Singh

..... Appellant

Versus

Pepsu Road Transport Corporation, Patiala and others

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present : Mr. R.S.Chauhan, Advocate
for the appellant.

Mr. Karan Singla, Advocate
for respondents No.1 and 2.

Mr. Sanjay Tangri, Advocate
for respondent No.4.

AJAY TEWARI, J. (Oral)

This appeal has been filed against the concurrent judgments of the Courts below dismissing the suit of the appellant to the effect that he was entitled for pension and not for contributory provident fund.

Both the Courts below found that the appellant did not opt for the pension scheme in the year 1992. Learned counsel for the appellant has argued that this finding is not correct because actually no option was ever called from him. In this connection, the trial Court held as follows :-

“In his cross examination, PW-1 has denied that he did not file his option in pension scheme of 1992.”

A perusal of this extract shows that the case of the appellant-plaintiff was rather that he knew about the pension scheme and consequently not much weight can be given to the argument being raised today.

Appeal is dismissed. No costs.

Since the main case has been decided, the pending civil miscellaneous application, if any, also stands disposed of.

**(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE**

21.09.2017
pooja sharma-I

Whether speaking/reasoned - Yes/No

Whether reportable - Yes/No