

107            **IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH**

**CWP No. 16424 of 2018  
DECIDED ON: AUGUST 08, 2018**

**GURCHARAN SINGH**

**...PETITIONER**

**VERSUS**

**PUNJAB STATE POWER CORPORATION LTD. & ANR.**

**...RESPONDENTS**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH**

Present:     Mr. Rohit Garg, Advocate for  
                 Ms. Amrik Kaur, Advocate  
                 for the petitioner.

\*\*\*\*

**JASPAL SINGH, J. (ORAL)**

By virtue of the instant civil writ petition, preferred under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, petitioner has sought the issuance of a writ particularly in the nature of Mandamus directing the respondents to grant him the benefit of 23 year advance promotional increment(s), w.e.f 30.07.2010 as per the principal policy under Finance Circular No.17/1990 dated 23.04.1990 (Annexure P1) amended from time to time with all consequential relief that too, with interest @18% per annum.

2.            The contention of learned counsel for the petitioner is that the petitioner has joined respondent-department as Asstt. Lineman on 12.10.1983

and retired from service on 31.07.2013, thus, he became entitled for the release of benefit of 23 years promotional increment but no such benefit was granted to him till date. He further contended that though the similar relief has already been granted to the other employees of the State of Punjab vide judgments passed by this Court in CWP No.20139 of 2015 (*Chiman Singh Vs. Punjab State Power Corporation Ltd. & ors.*) decided on 29.02.2016 (P-6) and CWP No. 7157 of 2018 (*Mohan LaL Sharma vs. Punjab State Power Corporation Ltd. & Ors*) decided on 22.03.2018 (P-7). The petitioner stood retired on 31.07.2013 on attaining the age of superannuation. The petitioner being aggrieved of the non-disbursal of the benefits of 23 years promotional increment was constrained to move representation dated 14.03.2018 (P-4), but till date no response has been received. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioner feels satisfied in case a direction is given to respondents, to decide the aforesaid representation (P-4), within a stipulated period.

3. Without expressing any opinion on merits of the case but considering the aforesaid aspects as has been unfolded by the learned counsel for the petitioner, instant petition is disposed of with a direction to respondents to look into the grievances unfolded by the petitioner in his representation dated 14.03.2018 (P-4) and to take a conscious decision within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order, particularly in the light of the Circular Nos. 17/90, dated 23.04.1990 (P-1), 52/99 dated 09.11.1999 (P-2) and 20/2000, dated 28.07.2000 (P-3)) as well as the judgments referred to above in para 2 of this order. In case, competent authority comes to the conclusion that petitioner is entitled to the relief(s) claimed, the same be

released to him within a period of next 45 days.

4. However, if petitioner still feels aggrieved by any of the orders passed by the aforesaid authority, he shall be at liberty to have recourse to other remedies available to him under law including to approach this Court.

(JASPAL SINGH)  
JUDGE

AUGUST 08, 2018

sham

***Whether speaking/reasoned:*** ***Yes/No***

***Whether Reportable:*** ***Yes/No***