

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Sr. No.129

Civil Writ Petition No.24686 of 2018
DECIDED ON: September 26, 2018

KEDAR NATH SHARMA AND OTHERS

..PETITIONERS

VERSUS

UTTAR HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM LIMITED AND
OTHERS

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH

Present: Mr. Umesh Narang, Advocate, for the petitioners.

JASPAL SINGH, J. (ORAL)

By virtue of the instant civil writ petition, preferred under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, petitioners have sought an issuance of a writ in the nature of Mandamus directing the respondents to grant one additional increment of higher responsibility under Rule 4.4(2) (c) (i) as per Vol-1, Part-1 of Punjab Civil Services Rules and in lieu of judgment rendered in CWP No.3922 of 2011 titled as *Narender Pal Singh Arya & another vs. State of Haryana & ors.* and other connected cases decided on 03.10.2016 (P-2) as well as letter dated 15.03.2018 (P-3) issued by Finance Department, Haryana on getting promotion on the post of SDO from the date of promotion and re-fix the pay of the petitioners and revised their pension WITH FURTHER direction to the respondents to release the arrear of difference between due and drawn to them along with interest @ 18% per annum.

Civil Writ Petition No.24686 of 2018

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that though a legal notice was made to the respondents on 08.04.2018 (P-4) but till date no conscious decision has been taken thereon. He further submits that petitioners feel satisfied in case a direction is issued to respondents particularly respondents No.1 & 2 to decide the aforesaid legal notice (P-4) in view of aforesaid judgment and letter (P-2 & P-3), 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 respondents particularly respondents No.1 & 2 to look into the grievances unfolded by the petitioners in the legal notice dated 08.04.2018 (P-4) and to take a conscious decision by passing a speaking order particularly in view of the judgment and letter referred to above in para no.1 of this order, within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

4. However, if petitioners still feel aggrieved by any of the orders passed by the aforesaid authority, they shall be at liberty to have recourse to the other remedies available under law as well as to approach this Court.

September 26, 2018

Ankur

**(JASPAL SINGH)
JUDGE**

**Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable**

**Yes
Yes/No**