

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.18678 OF 2018  
DECIDED ON: AUGUST 01, 2018

GIAN CHAND (DECEASED)  
THROUGH WIDOW

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

PUNJAB STATE POWER CORPORATION  
LTD. AND ORS.

.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH

Present: Mr. Saravpreet Gurna, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.

\*\*\*\*\*

JASPAL SINGH, J.

By virtue of instant civil writ petition, preferred under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, petitioner has sought the issuance of a writ of Mandamus directing the respondents to grant him the benefit of 23 year advance promotional increment(s) w.e.f. 13.05.2008 as per principal policy under Finance Circular No.17/90 dated 23.04.1990 (P-1) and in view of judgments passed by this Court in CWP No.20139 of 2015 (P-6) and CWP No.7157 of 2018 (P-7) passed in cases of similarly situated persons, with consequential re-fixation of pay and retiral benefits and to release the arrears of revised pay and retiral benefits along with interest @ 18% p.a.

2. The contention of learned counsel for the petitioner is that Gian Chand joined respondent-department as Assistant Lineman on 13.05.1985. He

was never promoted and expired in service on 21.01.2012 while working under Addl.SE/Sr. Executive Engineer/Operation, PSPCL DS Division Rajpura. After the death of Gian Chand, his wife being widow is entitled for the release of benefit of 23 years promotional increment but no such benefit was granted to her 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 and CWP No.7157 of 2018 (*Mohan Lal Sharma v. Punjab State Power Corporation Ltd. And ors.*) decided on 22.03.2018. The widow of Gian Chand (deceased) being aggrieved of the non-disbursal of the benefits of 23 years promotional increment was constrained to serve legal notice upon the respondents on 04.06.2018 (P-5), but till date no response has been received. Learned counsel further submits that he feels satisfied in case a direction is given to respondent(s), to decide the aforesaid legal notice (P-5), 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 respondent(s) to look into the grievances unfolded by the petitioner in legal notice (P-5) 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) as well as the judgments referred to above in para 2 of this order. In case, competent authorities come 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, she shall be at liberty to have recourse to other remedies available to him under law including to approach this Court.

AUGUST 01, 2018  
sonika

(JASPAL SINGH)  
JUDGE

|                                  |               |
|----------------------------------|---------------|
| <i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i> | <i>Yes</i>    |
| <i>Whether reportable</i>        | <i>Yes/No</i> |