

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.6712 OF 2018  
DECIDED ON: MARCH 19, 2018

SHAMSHER SINGH

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH

Present: Mr. Kapil Kakkar, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.

\*\*\*\*\*

JASPAL SINGH, J.

Through instant petition preferred under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, petitioner has sought issuance of a writ especially in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to count the service rendered by him in Hydel Project, Department of Irrigation, Flying Squad and Municipal Council, Gobindgarh (which were owned and controlled by Department of Local Government) before his permanent appointment in the office of Director of Local Government Punjab i.e. respondent No.3 towards pension and other retiral benefits along with interest.

2. At the very outset of the arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that though legal notice dated 17.04.2017 (Annexure P-9) was duly served upon the respondents but till date it did not fetch any response. He further submits that petitioner feels satisfied, in case,

direction is issued to respondent No.3 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.3-The Director, Department of Local Government, Punjab Municipal Bhawan, Plot No.03, Sector 35-A, Chandigarh to look into the grievances unfolded by the petitioner in legal notice dated 17.04.2017 (Annexure P-9) and to decide the same particularly in view of judgments passed by this Court in **CWP No. 7120-2002**, titled as **“Smt. Krishna Khullar v. State of Punjab and another”**, decided on 26.02.2008 (Annexure P-10), **CWP No. 10008-2006 (O&M)**, titled as **“Ram Singh and another vs. State of Punjab and ors.”** decided on 23.02.2010 (Annexure P-11) and **CWP No.506-2008**, titled as **“Ish Kumar Arya v. State of Punjab and another”**, decided on 22.03.2010 (Annexure P-12), within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

4. However, if the petitioner still feels dissatisfied against the order passed by the concerned authority, he shall be at liberty to have recourse to the other remedies available under law as well as to approach this Court.

MARCH 19, 2018  
sonika

(JASPAL SINGH)  
JUDGE

|                                  |               |
|----------------------------------|---------------|
| <b>Whether speaking/reasoned</b> | <b>Yes</b>    |
| <b>Whether reportable</b>        | <b>Yes/No</b> |