

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 2817 OF 2018
DECIDED ON: FEBRUARY 08, 2018

DALJIT SINGH

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

PUNJAB STATE POWER CORP. LTD
AND OTHERS

.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH

Present: Mr. Brijesh Nandan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

JASPAL SINGH, J.

By virtue of instant petition preferred under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, petitioners have sought issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus, directing the respondents to grant the benefit of promotional increment(s), in view of circular dated 23.04.1990 (P-1), especially in view of judgments passed by this Court in CWP No. 20139 of 2015 (P-9), CWP No. 10689 of 2016 (P-10) and CWP-27468-2017 (P-12) as well as in view of office orders (Annexures P-5 to P-7) passed by respondent-corporation by which the benefit of 23 years promotional increment has already been granted to the similar situated employees.

2. At the very outset of the arguments, learned counsel for the petitioners submits petitioner feels satisfied in case direction is issued to respondent(s) to decide legal notice dated 30.05.2017 (Annexure P-11), within a

stipulated period.

3. Instant petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent(s) to look into the grievances unfolded by the petitioner in legal notice dated 30.05.2017 (Annexure P-11) and to decide the same as per circular dated 23.04.1990 (Annexure P-1) and considering the judgments passed by this Court in CWP No.20139 of 2015, titled as ***“Chiman Singh v. Punjab State Power Corporation Ltd. and ors”***, decided on 29.02.2016 (Annexure P-9), CWP No. 10689 of 2016, titled as ***“Gursharan Singh v. Punjab State Power Corporation Ltd. and ors”***, decided on 26.05.2016 (Annexure P-10) and CWP No. 27468 of 2017, titled as ***“Jaspal Singh v. Punjab State Power Corporation Ltd. and ors”***, decided on 02.12.2017 (Annexure P-12) as well as in view of office orders (Annexures P-5 to P-7), within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. However, relief shall stand restricted to 38 months in view of Full Bench judgment of this Court in ***“Saroj Kumari v. State of Punjab and others”***, 1998(3) SCT 664.

4. However, if the petitioner still feels aggrieved against the order passed by the concerned authority, he shall be at liberty to approach this Court.

FEBRUARY 08, 2018
sonika

(JASPAL SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned ***Yes***

Whether reportable ***Yes/No***