

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.19882 OF 2018
DECIDED ON: AUGUST 10, 2018

CHIMAN LALPETITIONER

VERSUS

PUNJAB STATE POWER CORP. LTD.RESPONDENTS
AND OTHERS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH

Present: Mr. S.K. Rattan, Advocate for the petitioner.

JASPAL SINGH, J.

By virtue of instant petition, preferred under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, petitioner has sought issuance of a writ especially in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to grant revised pension as well as other pensionary benefits by counting work charge service w.e.f. 01.04.1979 to 17.10.1991, which becomes 12 years 6 months and 16 days approx. along with regular service w.e.f. 18.10.1991 to 31.05.2013, which becomes around 21 years 7 months and 13 days approx. and total service become 34 years approx., but petitioner granted pension only for 43 half years, whereas he is entitled for pension for 34 years (68 half years) and further grant of interest @ 12% p.a. on revised pension and other pensionary benefits for which petitioner is entitled.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that though a legal notice dated 21.06.2018 (P-7) was served upon the respondents but till date neither any reply to the said legal notice has been received nor any final order has been passed by the respondents.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that he feels satisfied in case a direction is issued to respondent No.2 to decide his legal notice dated 21.06.2018 (P-7) in a time bound manner.

6. In view of above, instant petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2-Senior Executive Engineer, Distribution Division, Punjab State Power Corporation Limited, Mukerian, Distt. Hoshiarpur to look into the grievances unfolded by the petitioner in his legal notice dated 21.06.2018 (P-7) and to take a conscious decision by passing a speaking order in view of judgment **“Kesar Chand vs. State of Punjab, AIR 1988, Punjab, 265** within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order. In case, competent authorities comes to the conclusion that petitioner is entitled to the relief(s) claimed, same be released to him within a period of next one month. Factum of interest in view of judgment passed by Full Bench of this Court in case **A.S. Randhawa vs. State of Punjab & Ors., 1997 (3) SCT 468** as well as judgment passed by this Court in **Baldev Singh vs. State of Punjab and Anr.**, CWP No.24845 of 2015, decided on August 01, 2017, be also considered on delayed payment(s).

7. However, if petitioner still feels aggrieved by any of the orders passed by the aforesaid authority concerned, he shall be at liberty to approach this Court as well as to have recourse to the remedies available under law.

AUGUST 10, 2018
sonika

(JASPAL SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned **Yes**
Whether reportable **Yes/No**