

CWP No. 8663 of 2018
DECIDED ON: MAY 09, 2018

NIRMAL KUMARI & ORS

.....PETITIONERS

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS

.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH

Present: Mr. Vikas Chatrath, Advocate with
Mr. Manreet Singh Sidhu, Advocate
for the petitioners.

JASPAL SINGH, J (ORAL)

Through the instant civil writ petition, preferred under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, petitioners have sought the issuance of a writ in the nature of Mandamus directing the respondents to release them the benefits of revised pensionary benefits after re-fixation of pay in terms of Haryana Civil Services (Revised Pay) Rules, 1998 as well as the law laid down in **Om Parkash and others vs. State of Haryana and others; 2008 (3) SCT 310 DB**; decided on 10.04.2008 (P-5) as well as revised pension along-with interest @18% per annum WITH FURTHER prayer for issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari to quash the order dated 05.08.2008 (P-6) and also to issue directions to consider their case in the light of judgment passed in CWP No. 8877 of 2009, titled as **Baljeet Singh and others vs. State of Haryana & others; decided on 28.06.2010 (P-12) as well as Om Parkash and others vs. State of Haryana and others; 2008 (3) SCT 301 DB**; decided on 10.04.2008 (P-5).

2. At the very outset, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that though a legal notice dated 16.08.2016 (P-12) was duly served upon the respondents but despite the fact that a period of more than 1 ½ years is going to elapse no conscious decision has been taken. He further submits that he feels satisfied in case a direction is issued to respondents to consider and decide the legal notice dated 16.08.2016 (P-12) in a time bound manner.

3. In the light of afore-said facts and circumstances but without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, instant petition is disposed of with a direction to respondents to look into the grievances unfolded by the petitioners in the legal notice dated 16.08.2016 (P-12) and to take a conscious decision by passing a speaking order considering all the facts narrated in the aforesaid legal notice within a period of four months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

4. However, if petitioners still feel aggrieved by any of the orders passed by the aforesaid authority, they shall be at liberty to have recourse to other remedies available to them under law including to approach this Court.

MAY 09, 2018
sham

(JASPAL SINGH)
JUDGE

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