

CWP-16459-2018

-1-

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

**CWP-16459-2018**

**Date of decision-09.07.2018**

**Jagjit Singh**

**...Petitioner**

**Vs.**

**Punjab State Transmission Co.Ltd.and others**

**...Respondents**

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN**

Present: Mr. P.S.Dhaliwal, Advocate for the petitioner.

\*\*\*

**JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J. (Oral)**

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 directing the respondents to grant extension of two years of service in terms of the policy to the petitioner who being a disabled person is entitled for the same.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that case of the petitioner is covered by a judgment passed by this Court in CWP-7233-2010 titled as “**Bhupinder Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and others**” decided on 25.05.2011 (Annexure P-6). He further states that at this stage he would be satisfied, if a direction is issued to respondent No.2- Superintending Engineer, Planning and Communication, PSTCL Patiala, District Patiala to consider and decide the application/letter dated 08.12.2017 (Annexure P-2) in the light of Annexure P-6 prior to the date of superannuation of the petitioner which is stated to be on 31.07.2018.

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.2- Superintending Engineer, Planning and Communication, PSTCL Patiala, District Patiala to consider and decide the application/letter dated 08.12.2017 (Annexure P-2) in the light of Annexure P-6 prior to the date of superannuation of the petitioner. 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. However, in case the competent authority feels that the relief claimed by the petitioner is not admissible or made out, in that case, a speaking order be passed in the matter.

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)  
JUDGE

09.07.2018  
vanita

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