

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.25067 OF 2018
DECIDED ON: SEPTEMBER 28, 2018

ASHOK KUMAR

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

PUNJAB STATE POWER CORP. LTD.
AND ORS.

.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH

Present: Mr. Gagneshwar Walia, 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 in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to revise the pensionary benefits i.e. pension, commuted pension, gratuity after revising his pay scale by granting 3 increments as already granted to diploma holder (JEs) on the principle of equal pay for equal work and in terms of decision dated 13.11.2017 given by this Court in RSA No.4355 of 2014, titled as PSEB v. Gurdial Singh (P-10) upholding the judgment of appellate court dated 12.03.2014 (P-11) along with consequential arrears and grant 23 years promotional increment in view of circular dated 23.04.1990 and in view of judgment dated 14.12.2015 passed by this Court in CWP No.16737 of 2011, titled as Om Parkash Dua v. Punjab State Electricity Board (P-6) and dated 20.12.2016 in CWP No.10994 of 2016, Pritpal

Singh vs. Punjab State Power Corporation Ltd. (P-8) and in view of letter dated 11.05.2015 (P-9) whereby the benefit of 23 years promotional increment has already been granted to the similarly situated employees.

2. At the very outset of the arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that though legal notice dated 14.05.2018 (P-12) was duly served upon the respondents but till date neither any response has been received nor any conscious decision has been taken thereon. He further submits that petitioner feels satisfied in case direction is issued to respondents to decide legal notice (P-12) within a stipulated period.

3. Accordingly, instant petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent(s) to consider the case unfolded by the petitioner in legal notice (Annexure P-12) and to take a conscious decision in the light of judgments already referred to in the legal notice, within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

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

SEPTEMBER 28, 2018
sonika

(JASPAL SINGH)
JUDGE

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