

**CWP No. 8972 of 2018
DECIDED ON: APRIL 16, 2018**

UMRAO SINGH

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.

.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH

Present: Mr. K.L. Dhingra, Advocate
for the petitioner.

JASPAL SINGH, J (ORAL)

By virtue of instant petition preferred under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, petitioner has sought a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to revise his pension and other retiral benefits and grant him deemed date promotion as Principal and notional fixation of pay as has been done in the case of Prithvi Singh vide order dated November 28, 2016 (P-5) as well as in the case of Sadhu Singh vide order dated December 21, 2015 (P-6) and accordingly their notional pay has been fixed and pension revised with consequential benefits as they are junior to the petitioner and getting more pension etc. with further direction to respondents to decide the legal notice dated January 08, 2018 (P-12) in view of instructions issued by the Chief Secretary to Government of Haryana dated March 22, 2004 (P-12-A).

2. The contention of learned counsel for the petitioner is that the same benefit has already been granted to the employees junior to the petitioners vide orders dated December 21, 2015 (P-6) and November 28, 2016 (P-5). Petitioner served a legal notice dated January 08, 2018 (P-12) upon the respondents but despite the fact that a period of more than three months has already expired, 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 afore-said legal notice (P-12) within a time bound manner.

3. Without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, instant petition is disposed of with a direction to respondents particularly respondent No.1 to look into the grievances unfolded by the petitioner in the legal notice dated January 08, 2018 (P-12) in accordance with law, rules and regulations within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

4. In case petitioner still feels aggrieved by any order of the afore-said authority, he shall be at liberty to have recourse to other remedies available to him under law including to approach this Court.

APRIL 16, 2018
sham

(JASPAL SINGH)
JUDGE

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