

**CWP No. 18900 of 2018
DECIDED ON: AUGUST 01, 2018**

BIMLA DEVI

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS

.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH

Present: Mr. Padamkant Dwivedi, Advocate
for the petitioner.

JASPAL SINGH, J (ORAL)

By virtue of instant petition preferred under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, petitioner has sought a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to release her retiral dues including gratuity, leave encashment, CPF etc along-with interest @ 18% per annum with further direction to release arrears of salary to her in the revised pay scale as per the recommendations made by the 5th Pay Commission for the period 01.01.2006 to 21.08.2009 as well as 33% arrears of revised salary in terms of recommendations made by the 4th Pay Commission.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that though a legal notice dated 03.04.2018 (P-3) was duly served upon the respondents but till date neither any reply to the afore-said notice has been received nor any conscious

decision has been taken. He further submits that petitioner feels satisfied in case a direction is issued to respondents to consider and decide the afore-said legal notice dated 03.04.2018 (P-3) in a time bound manner.

3. In view of submission made by learned counsel for the petitioner but without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, instant petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.3 to look into the grievances unfolded by the petitioner in the legal notice dated 03.04.2018 (P-3) and to take a conscious decision in accordance with law, rules and regulations particularly view of judgments passed by this Court in CWP No. 9497 of 2014, titled *Narinder Kaur vs. State of Punjab and others*, decided on 28.07.2016 (P-4) and CWP No. 2155 of 2016, titled *Shakuntla Devi & others vs. State of Punjab and others*; decided on 24.10.2017 (P-6), within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

4. However, in case petitioner still feels aggrieved by any of the order(s) passed by the afore-said authority, she shall be at liberty to have recourse to other remedies available under law as well as to approach this Court.

AUGUST 01, 2018
sham

(JASPAL SINGH)
JUDGE

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