

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.20316 OF 2018
DECIDED ON: AUGUST 16, 2018

DR. NEELAM SIDHU

....PETITIONER..

VS.

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS.

....RESPONDENTS..

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH

Present:- Mr. Vinod K. Kaushal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

JASPAL SINGH, J.

Through instant petition, preferred under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, petitioner has sought issuance of a writ especially in the nature of mandamus directing the respondent to release interest on delayed payment of leave encashment as per law.

2. At the very outset of the arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner feels satisfied in case direction is issued to respondent(s) to decide legal notice dated 21.06.2018 (P-4), in a time bound manner.

3. Without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, instant petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent(s) to reconsider the legal notice (P-4) and take a conscious decision, in the light of observations made by

Full Bench of this Court in case captioned as ***“R.S. Randhawa vs. State of***

Punjab, 1997 (3) RSJ 318 as well as Punjab Govt. Instructions No.1/15/90IFPIII/4226, dated 10.05.1990, within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order. If the concerned authority comes to the conclusion that petitioner is entitled to relief claimed through legal notice (P-4), to make the payment thereof within a period of next one month.

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

AUGUST 16, 2018
sonika

(JASPAL SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes
Whether reportable:	Yes/No