

CWP No. 12446 of 2018
DECIDED ON: MAY 17, 2018

KARAM SINGH AND ORS.

.....PETITIONERS

VERSUS

PUNJAB STATE POWER CORPORATION LTD. AND ORS.

.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH

Present: Ms. Rupinder Kaur Kanwal, Advocate
for the petitioners.

JASPAL SINGH, J (ORAL)

By virtue of instant petition preferred under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, petitioners have sought issuance of a writ especially in the nature of mandamus, directing the respondents to grant the benefit of 23 years of promotional increment(s) in view of circular dated 23.04.1990 (P-2) especially in view of judgment passed by this Court in CWP No. 20139 of 2015, titled as *Chiman Singh vs. Punjab State Power Corporation Ltd. & others;* decided on 29.02.2016 (P-4), whereby, the benefit of 23 years promotional increment has already been granted to the similarly situated employees.

2. At the very outset of the arguments, learned counsel for the petitioners submit that petitioners moved representations dated 13.02.2018 (Annexures P-5 to P-7) but till date no conscious decision has been taken. He further submits that petitioners feel satisfied in case direction is issued to respondent(s) to decide representations dated 13.02.2018 (Annexures P-5 to P-7), within a stipulated period.

3. Instant petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.1- Chairman-cum-Managing Director, Punjab State Power Corporation Ltd, The Mall, Patiala to look into the grievances unfolded by the petitioners in their respective representation(s) dated 13.02.2018 (Annexures P-5 to P-7) and to decide the same as per circular dated 23.04.1990 (Annexure P-1) as well as in view of judgment passed by this Court in CWP No. 20139 of 2015, titled as **Chiman Singh vs. Punjab State Power Corporation Ltd. & others;** decided on 29.02.2016 (P-4), within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. However, it is made clear that the claim of petitioners shall stand restricted to 38 months (after the expiry of three months period from the date of retirement of the petitioners) in view law laid down by Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Saroj Kumari vs. State of Punjab and others; 1998 (3) SCT 664**, as there is an inordinate delay on the part of the petitioners in approaching the Court.

4. However, if the petitioners still feel aggrieved against the order passed by the concerned authority, they shall be at liberty to have recourse to the other remedies as well as to approach this Court.

MAY 17, 2018
sham

(JASPAL SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No