

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

**CWP No.8184 OF 2018
DECIDED ON: APRIL 03, 2018**

INDER PAL

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH

Present: Mr. Rajeev Dev Sharma, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

JASPAL SINGH, J.

By virtue of instant petition preferred under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, the petitioner has sought issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to pay the complete retiral/service benefits such as Leave Encashment, Gratuity, General Provident Fund, arrears of salary and pension along with arrears as well as interest on delayed payment of all the pensionary benefits and other arrears.

2. At the very outset of the arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that though representation dated 15.01.2018 (Annexure P-2) was moved to the respondents but till date neither any response has been received nor any conscious decision has been taken thereon. He submits that petitioner feels satisfied in case direction is issued to respondent No.4 to decide aforesaid representation within a stipulated period.

3. Without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, instant petition is disposed of with the direction to respondent No.4-Commissioner, Municipal Corporation, Pathankot, District Pathankot to look into the grievances unfolded by the petitioner in representation dated 15.01.2018 (Annexure P-2) and to decide the same within a period of two months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. If there is no impediment in granting all the benefits, to release the same within a period of next 45 days.

4. As far as grant of interest on delayed payment is concerned that shall also be considered in view of the observations made by Full Bench of this Court in case captioned as *“A.S. Randhawa vs. State of Punjab and others, 1997 (3) SCT 468* as well as *Punjab Govt. Instructions No.1/15/90IFPIII/4226, dated 10.05.1990.*

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

APRIL 03, 2018
sonika

(JASPAL SINGH)
JUDGE

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