

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

**CWP No.4480 OF 2018
DECIDED ON: FEBRUARY 23, 2018**

VED PARKASH GUPTA

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH

Present: Mr. Shalender Mohan, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

JASPAL SINGH, J

By virtue of instant petition preferred under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, petitioner has sought issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus, directing the respondents to allow pension and pensionary benefits by taking into consideration the service rendered by him w.e.f. 01.01.1996 to 31.12.2011 i.e. 15 years as he has deposited contributory share of provident fund qua management share along with interest. AND further to revise the pension and pensionary benefits after computing service w.e.f. 01.01.1996 to 31.12.2011 and release the difference between due and drawn of the retiral benefits like pension, gratuity, commutation and leave encashment along with interest.

2. At the very outset, learned counsel for the petitioner submits though legal notice dated 30.08.2017 (Annexure P-5) was duly served upon the

respondents but till date neither any response has been received nor any conscious decision has been taken by them. He further submits that petitioner feels satisfied in case direction is issued to respondent No.2 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.2-The Director, Haryana School Education, Shiksha Sadan, Panchkula, Haryana to look into the grievances unfolded by the petitioner in legal notice dated 30.08.2017 (Annexure P-5) and to decide the same particularly keeping in view the judgment passed by this Court in CWP-7684-2015 (O&M), captioned as ***“Ishwar Singh v. State of Haryana and others”***, decided on 09.08.2016 (Annexure P-4), within a period of 3 months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

4. In case, the petitioner still feels aggrieved against any of the order(s) passed by the concerned authority, he shall be at liberty to have recourse to the other remedies available under law including filing of writ petition.

FEBRUARY 23, 2018
sonika

(JASPAL SINGH)
JUDGE

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