

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.12475 OF 2018
DECIDED ON: MAY 17, 2018

HARNEK SINGH

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

PUNJAB STATE POWER CORPORATION
LTD. AND ORS.

.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH

Present: Ms. Harpinder Kaur Sandhu, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

JASPAL SINGH, J.

By virtue of instant civil writ petition, preferred under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, petitioner has sought issuance of a writ particularly in the nature of Mandamus directing the respondents to grant him the benefit of promotional increment(s) in view of Circular dated 23.04.1990 (P-1) and in view of judgments passed by this Court in CWP No.10808 of 2007 (P-10) as well as in view of office orders dated 12.06.2015 (P-11 to P-12) passed by the respondent-corporation by which benefit of 23 years promotional increment has already been granted to the similar situated employees. As well as release interest @ 18% p.a. from the date when it became due till its realization.

2. At the very outset of the arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that though legal notice dated 22.02.2018 (Annexure P-4) was duly served upon the respondents but till date no conscious decision has

been taken. He further submits that petitioner feels satisfied in case direction is issued to respondent(s) to decide aforesaid legal notice, within a stipulated period

3. Instant petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent(s) to look into the grievances unfolded by the petitioner in legal notice dated 22.02.2018 (Annexure P-4) and to decide the same in view of circular dated 23.04.1990 (Annexure P-1) as well as in the light of judgment passed by this Court in CWP No.10808 of 2007 (P-10) and in view of office orders dated 12.06.2015 (P-11 to P-12), within a period of four months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. However, relief shall stand restricted to 38 months in view of Full Bench judgment of this Court in *“Saroj Kumari v. State of Punjab and others”, 1998(3) SCT 664.*

4. However, if the petitioner still feels aggrieved against any of the order(s) passed by the concerned authority, he shall be at liberty to have recourse to the remedies available under law as well as to approach this Court.

MAY 17, 2018
sonika

(JASPAL SINGH)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>