

224-2

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

RA-CW-88-2017 in
CWP No. 20353 of 2013
Date of Decision: 30.10.2017

SATISH CHANDER SACHDEVA

... Petitioner

V/s.

UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present: Mr. K.S. Dadwal, Advocate,
for the applicant-respondent No. 2

Mr. C.M. Munjal, Advocate,
for the non-applicant/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)

Heard.

Learned counsel for the applicant respondent No. 2 states that since there was no delay in the payment, therefore, order dated 17.10.2016 passed by this Court in CWP No. 20353 of 2013 is liable to be reviewed.

After going through the facts and circumstances of the case, I am of the view that it is mentioned in the aforesaid order dated 17.10.2016 itself that the respondents were to check up whether the interest on the delayed payment has been paid or not. It is further mentioned in the said order that if the payment has not been paid, the same shall be paid alongwith interest @ 8% per annum.

Therefore, the delay in payment, if any, is to be decided by the applicant-respondent No. 2 and only if there is delay in making the payment, then interest @ 8% is to be paid on the said payment.

In view of the above, no ground is made out to review the aforesaid order dated 17.10.2016 passed by this Court. Hence, the present review application stands dismissed.

October 30, 2017
Suresh Kumar

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking / reasoned</i>	:	✓ <i>Yes</i>	/	<i>No</i> ✓
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	:	<i>Yes</i>	/	<i>No</i>