

**CWP No.9354 of 2018
DECIDED ON: APRIL 19, 2018**

P. S. MEHTA

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

PANJAB UNIVERSITY AND ORS

.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH

Present: Mr. Dinesh Kumar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

JASPAL SINGH, J (ORAL)

By virtue of instant petition preferred under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, petitioner has sought a writ in the nature of mandamus directed the respondents to release the commuted value of pension in accordance with Rule 7.1 of Panjab University Employees (Pension) Regulations, 1991 as well as in view of law laid down by this Court in CWP No. 14796 of 2009 titled as Ved Parkash Jhingan vs. Panjab University, Chandigarh and another, decided on 24.09.2010 (P-8) with further direction to consider and decide the claim made out in the representation dated 23.07.2015 (P-3) followed by another representation dated 23.07.2015 (P-4) as well as the legal notice dated 23.12.2017 (P-7) with the stipulated period.

2. At the very outset learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that though legal notice dated 23.12.2017 (Annexure P-7) was duly served upon

the respondents but till date neither any reply has been received nor any conscious decision has been taken. He further submits that petitioner feel satisfied in case direction is issued to respondent(s) to decide the aforesaid legal notice, within a stipulated period.

3. 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 petitioner in the legal notice dated 23.12.2017 (P-7) and to decide the same in accordance with law, rules, regulations particularly in view of judgment rendered by this Court in in CWP No. 14796 of 2009 titled as ***Ved Parkash Jhingan vs. Panjab University, Chandigarh and another***, decided on 24.09.2010 (P-8) as well as LPA No. 1148 of 2011, titled as ***Panjab University, Chandigarh and another vs. Ved Parkash Jhingan***, which was dismissed on 13.07.2011 (P-9), within a period of four months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

4. However, in case the petitioner still feels aggrieved by any of the order passed by the concerned authority, he shall be at liberty to have recourse to other remedies available to him under law as well as to approach this Court.

APRIL 19, 2018

sham

(JASPAL SINGH)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned *Yes/No*

Whether reportable *Yes/No*