

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH**

**CWP No.2565 OF 2018  
DECIDED ON: FEBRUARY 05, 2018**

**KEDAR NATH** **.....PETITIONER**

**VERSUS**

**UHBVNL AND OTHERS** **.....RESPONDENTS**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH**

Present: Mr. Randeep Singh, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.

\*\*\*\*\*

**JASPAL SINGH, J**

Instant petition has been preferred under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India by the petitioner seeking issuance of a writ, order or direction especially in the nature of mandamus, directing the respondents to count his daily wages services w.e.f. 1987 to 26.07.1990 as “qualifying service” towards pensionary benefits.

2. The contention of learned counsel for the petitioner is that petitioner was employed as Assistant Lineman by the respondents on daily wages for line work/field work in the year 1979. Thereafter, on 26.07.1990, his services were regularised as Assistant Lineman. Ultimately, on 31.12.2015, he retired from service after attaining the age of superannuation but the respondent-department while fixing the pensionary benefits has not counted his daily wages service period i.e. 1979 to 26.07.1990 towards “qualifying service”. The

petitioner moved various representations but no conscious decision has been taken. Even, he served legal notice dated 11.09.2017 (Annexure P-7) upon the respondents, but neither it fetch any reply nor any conscious decision has been taken. He submits that petitioner feels satisfied in case direction is issued to respondent No.1 to decide aforesaid legal notice, within a stipulated period.

3. Without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is disposed of with the direction to respondent No.1-Managing Director, UHBVNL, Vidyut Bhawan, Sector 6, Panchkula to look into the grievances unfolded by the petitioner in legal notice dated 11.09.2017 (Annexure P-7) and to take a conscious decision, by passing a speaking order, within a period of 3 months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

4. However, if the petitioner still feels aggrieved against any of the order(s) passed by the concerned authority, he shall be at liberty to approach this Court as well as to have recourse to the other remedies available to him under law.

**FEBRUARY 05, 2018**  
**sonika**

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

|                                         |                      |
|-----------------------------------------|----------------------|
| <b><i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i></b> | <b><i>Yes</i></b>    |
| <b><i>Whether reportable</i></b>        | <b><i>Yes/No</i></b> |