

124

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-15912-2018

Date of decision-04.07.2018

Balkar Singh

....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Ms. Suminderdeep Kaur, Advocate for
Mr. R.K.Kapila, Advocate for the petitioner.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J.

This writ petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India has been filed for the issuance of a writ, in the nature of mandamus to directing the respondents to count the daily wage service of the petitioner rendered before regularization as qualifying service for the purpose of pensionary/retiral benefits.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner states that case of the petitioner is covered by judgments passed by this Court in CWP-24472-2015, titled as “Constable Rajesh Kumar and others Vs. State of Punjab and another” decided on 07.01.2016 (Annexure P-5); CWP-26960-2016, titled as “Constable Jinder Pal Sharma and others Vs. State of Punjab and another” decided on 17.07.2017 (Annexure P-6) and CWP-21193-2017, titled as “Iqbal Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and another” decided on 18.09.2017 (Annexure P-7). She further states that at this stage she would

be satisfied, if a direction is issued to respondent No.1-Secretary, Punjab Civil Secretariat, Chandigarh to consider and decide the representation dated 20.02.2018 (Annexure P-8) in view of Annexures P-5 to P-7.

Heard.

In view of the above, without adverting to the merits of the case, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.1-Secretary, Punjab Civil Secretariat, Chandigarh to consider and decide the representation dated 20.02.2018 (Annexure P-8) in view of Annexures P-5 to P-7 within six weeks from the receipt of the certified copy of the order. In case, on consideration, the competent authority reaches to the conclusion that the benefit claimed by the petitioner is admissible to him, in such eventuality, the consequential relief be allowed to him, within a period of six weeks thereafter. However, in case the competent authority feels that the relief claimed by the petitioner is not admissible to him or made out, in that case, a speaking order be passed in the matter.

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

04.07.2018

vanita

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No