

116

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-6688-2018

Date of decision-19.03.2018

Des Raj and others

...Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. M.K.Dogra, Advocate for the petitioners.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J. (Oral)

This writ petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India has been filed for the issuance of a writ, in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to pay arrears of difference of pay after restoration of 4 special increments in accordance with the judgment passed by this Court in LPA-1161-2009 dated 08.09.2010 (Annexure P-8).

Learned counsel for the petitioners states that case of the petitioners is covered by the judgment passed by this Court in LPA-1161-2009 titled as “**Tarlok Chand and others Vs. State of Punjab and others**” decided on 08.09.2010 (Annexure P-8) and in CWP-25992-2015 and other connected matters titled as “**Kuldeep Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and others**” decided on 28.04.2016 (Annexure P-10) and another judgment passed by Hon'ble the Supreme Court in Civil Appeal No.6540-2014 titled as “**State of Punjab Vs. Tarlok Chand**” (Annexure P-9) Further, he states that at this stage he would be satisfied, if a direction is issued to respondent

No.2-Chief Engineer, Ranjit Sagar Dam, Shahpurkandi Township, Tehsil & Distt.Pathankot to consider and decide the representation dated 29.05.2017 (Annexure P-11) in the light of Annexures P-8, 9 and 10.

Heard.

In view of the above, without adverting to the merits of the case, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2-Chief Engineer, Ranjit Sagar Dam, Shahpurkandi Township, Tehsil & Distt.Pathankot to consider and decide the representation dated 29.05.2017 (Annexure P-11) in the light of Annexures P-8, 9 and 10 within six weeks from the receipt of the certified copy of the order. In case, on consideration, the competent authority reaches to the conclusion that the benefit claimed by the petitioners is admissible to them, in such eventuality, the consequential relief be allowed to them, within a period of six weeks thereafter. However, in case the competent authority feels that the relief claimed by the petitioners is not admissible to them or made out, in that case, a speaking order be passed in the matter.

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

19.03.2018

vanita

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No