

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

**CWP No. 2795 of 2017
DECIDED ON: JULY 31, 2018**

BIAS KAUR

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

PEPSU ROAD TRANSPORT CORPORATION & ORS

.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH

Present: Mr. C.S. Sharma, Advocate
 for the petitioner.

 Ms. Neha Sharma, Advocate
 for the respondents.

JASPAL SINGH, J (ORAL)

Through the instant petition preferred under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, petitioner has sought the issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondent-Corporation to count the work charge service/contract service followed by regular service for the purpose of increments and retiral benefits in view of service conditions, instructions, rules as adopted by the respondent-Corporation and various judgments governing the present case and consequently making an entry in the service book as well as to hold the said service is countable towards pensionary benefits specifically in view of judgments dated 01.12.2014 (P-2) and 19.04.2011 (P-3) passed by Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court with further direction to respondents to decide the legal notices dated 18.11.2016 (P-4 and P-5) within stipulated time.

2. Here, it would be pertinent to mention that respondent-Corporation has fairly conceded that no conscious decision has been taken on the legal notices dated 18.11.2016 (P-4 and P-5) till date and at this juncture, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he feels satisfied in case a direction is issued to respondents to decide the afore-said legal notices (P-4 and P-5) in a time bound manner.

3. In view of above but without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, instant petition is disposed of with a direction to respondents, to look into the grievances unfolded by the petitioner in the legal notices dated 18.11.2016 (P-4 and P-5) and to take a conscious decision in accordance with law, rules and regulations within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

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

JULY 31, 2018
sham

(JASPAL SINGH)
JUDGE

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