

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.22167 OF 2018  
DECIDED ON: SEPTEMBER 04, 2018

HARI SINGH

....PETITIONER..

VS.

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS.

....RESPONDENTS..

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH

Present:- Mr. Daman Jeet Bhoriwal, Advocate for the petitioner.

\*\*\*\*\*

JASPAL SINGH, J.(Oral)

Through instant petition, preferred under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, petitioner has sought issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to refix the revised pension as per revised pay scales vide circular/letter dated 15.12.2011 issued by govt. of Punjab (P-1). With further direction to the respondents that after refixing the revised pension as per letter dated 27.06.2017 (P-5) and letter dated 18.09.2017 (P-6), the case of the petitioner be sent to the office of Accountant General, Punjab for sanction and authorization, the Accountant General, Punjab would revise the pension and send revised authorization to the concerned District Treasury Officer/bank and to release all the consequential benefit along with interest @18%.

2. The contention of learned counsel for the petitioner is that the case of the petitioner was sent by respondent No.2 to the Branch Manager, State Bank of India (Pension Cell), Bathinda, conveyed to the petitioner vide endorsement dated 18.05.2018 instead of forwarding the same to the office of

Accountant General in the light of instructions issued by Government of Punjab dated 18.09.2017 (P-6).

3. He further contends that despite the fact that representations dated 26.05.2018 (P-10) and 13.06.2018 (P-11) were moved to the Under Secretary, Govt. of Punjab, Department of Revenue and Rehabilitation Revenue Estb. Branch-I, Civil Secretariat Chandigarh and the Financial Commissioner, Revenue (R.Estt-I Branch) Department of Punjab, Chandigarh but no action has been taken.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner feels satisfied in case direction is issued to respondent to decide the representations within a stipulated period.

5. Without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, instant petition is disposed of with a direction to respondents to consider the claim put forth by the petitioner in representations (P-10 and P-11) and take necessary steps. In the event, the respondent-authority comes to the conclusion that petitioner is not entitled to the relief claimed through representations, to pass a detailed and speaking order, within a period of one month from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

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

**SEPTEMBER 04, 2018**  
**sonika**

**(JASPAL SINGH)**  
**JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes

Whether reportable:

Yes/No