

**CWP No.13343 of 2018
DECIDED ON: MAY 24, 2018**

SAMPURAN SINGH AND ORS

.....PETITIONERS

VERSUS

PUNJAB STATE POWER CORPORATION LTD AND ORS

.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH

Present: Ms. Riti Aggarwal, Advocate
for the petitioners.

JASPAL SINGH, J. (ORDER)

By virtue of instant civil writ petition, preferred under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, petitioners have sought issuance of a writ particularly in the nature of Mandamus directing the respondents to grant them the benefit of 23 years 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. 20139 of 2015 and CWP No. 10994 of 2016 as well as in view of letter dated 11.05.2015 (P-9) issued by the respondent-corporation by which benefit of 23 years promotional increment has already been granted to the similar situated employees; that too along-with interest @ 12% p.a. from the date when it became due till its realization.

2. At the very outset of the arguments, learned counsel for the

petitioners submit that though legal notice dated 06.11.2017 (Annexure P-10) was duly served upon the respondents but till date no conscious decision has been taken. She further submits that petitioners feel satisfied in case direction is issued to respondent(s) to decide aforesaid legal notice, within a stipulated period

3. Without expressing any opinion on merit as well as in view of afore-said submission made by learned counsel for the petitioner, instant petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent(s) to look into the grievances unfolded by the petitioners in legal notice dated 06.11.2017(Annexure P-10) and to decide the same particularly in view of judgments passed by this Court in CWP No. 20139 of 2015 and CWP No. 10994 of 2016 as well as in view of letter dated 11.05.2015 (P-9), 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**, as there is a considerable delay on the part of petitioners in approaching the Court.

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

MAY 24, 2018
sham

(JASPAL SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No