

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 17962 OF 2017
DECIDED ON: JANUARY 29, 2018

TIRATH RAM AND OTHERSPETITIONERS

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERSRESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH

Present: Mr. Ashutosh Kaushik, Advocate
for the petitioners.

JASPAL SINGH, J.

By virtue of instant petition preferred under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, petitioners have sought issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus, directing the respondents to grant ACPs due after completion of 8/16/24/32 years of service as prescribed under the Assured Career Progression Scheme (ACP Scheme) formulated vide policy/circular dated 25.09.1998 (Annexure P-1) along with consequential benefits like re-fixation of pay and pension, its arrear etc. along with interest @ 18% per annum.

2. At the very outset of the arguments, learned counsel for the petitioners submits petitioners feel satisfied in case direction is issued to respondent(s) to decide legal notice dated 11.06.2017 (Annexure P-5), within a stipulated period.

3. Instant petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent(s) to

look into the grievances unfolded by the petitioners in their legal notice dated 11.06.2017 (Annexure P-5) and to decide the same in accordance with Rules, Regulations and Instructions issued by Govt. from time to time, within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. In case, the concerned authorities come to the conclusion that petitioners are entitled to the relief claimed, that would 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.

5. However, if the petitioners still feel aggrieved against the order passed by the concerned authority, they shall be at liberty to approach this Court.

JANUARY 29, 2018
sonika

(JASPAL SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned *Yes*

Whether reportable *Yes/No*