

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

**CWP No.8441 OF 2018
DECIDED ON: APRIL 05, 2018**

GURNAM SINGH

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

**THE CHAIRMAN-CUM-MANAGING DIRECTORRESPONDENTS
AND OTHERS**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH

Present: Ms. Tuneet Walia, 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 the benefit of promotional increment(s) in view of circulars dated 23.04.1990 and 18.11.2011 (Annexures P-1 and P-4 respectively) especially in view of judgments passed by this Court in CWP No. 28141 of 2017, decided on 12.12.2017, CWP No. 11585 of 2016, decided on 02.06.2016 and CWP No.20139 of 2015, decided on 29.02.2016 (Annexure P-5), consequent to which various orders passed by the respondent-corporation by which the benefit of 23 years promotional increment has already been granted to the similarly situated employees along with interest @ 18% p.a.

2. At the very outset of the arguments, learned counsel for the

petitioner submits petitioner feels satisfied in case direction is issued to respondent No.1 to decide legal notice dated 09.03.2018 (P-6), within a stipulated period.

3. Without expressing any opinion on merits of the case, instant petition is disposed of with the direction to respondent No.1- Chairman-cum-Managing Director, Punjab State Power Corporation Ltd, The Mall, Patiala to look into the grievances unfolded by the petitioner in legal notice dated 09.03.2018 (P-6) and to decide the same as per circulars dated 23.04.1990 and 18.11.2011 (Annexures P-1 and P-4 respectively) and in view of judgments passed by this Court in CWP No. 28141 of 2017, decided on 12.12.2017, CWP No. 11585 of 2016, decided on 02.06.2016 and CWP No.20139 of 2015, decided on 29.02.2016 (Annexure P-5), within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

4. Further, the petitioner shall be at liberty to have recourse to the other remedies as well as to approach this Court, in case, he still feels aggrieved against the order passed by the concerned authority.

APRIL 05, 2018
sonika

(JASPAL SINGH)
JUDGE

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