

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.4708 OF 2018
DECIDED ON: FEBRUARY 27, 2018

KULDIP KAURPETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHERRESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH

Present: Mr. Manu K. Bhandari, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

JASPAL SINGH, J.

By virtue of 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 grant family pension to her in view of law laid down by this Court in CWP No. 11802 of 2008, titled as “*Paramjit Kaur v. State of Punjab and ors.*” (Annexure P-6) and judgment dated 28.11.2017 (Annexure P-9) passed in CWP No.25708-2017 and to count the service rendered by her late husband on daily wage basis i.e. from 10.12.1992 to 08.12.2004 i.e. about 12 years as qualifying service for pension. And further to grant arrears of family pension, gratuity and other benefits from the date of death of her husband i.e. from 27.08.2012 along with interest @ 18% p.a.

2. At the very outset of the arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that though demand notice dated 07.09.2017 (Annexure P-7) was duly served upon the respondents and subsequent reminder dated

11.01.2018 (Annexure P-8) but neither the benefits have been disbursed to the petitioner nor any reply to the legal notice and reminder has been received. He further submits that petitioner feels satisfied in case direction is issued to respondents to decide aforesaid demand notice, within a stipulated period.

3. Instant petition is disposed of with the direction to respondents to look into the grievances unfolded by the petitioner in demand notice dated 07.09.2017 (Annexure P-7) and to decide the same in the light of observations made by this Court in case captioned as “*Paramjit Kaur v. The State of Punjab and ors*”, decided on 11.05.2016 (Annexure P-6) and “*Sukhwinder Kaur v. State of Punjab and others*”, decided on 28.11.2017 (Annexure P-9), within a period of three 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, she shall be at liberty to have recourse to the remedies as well as to approach this Court.

FEBRUARY 27, 2018
sonika

(JASPAL SINGH)
JUDGE

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