

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

**CWP No. 9903 OF 2018
DECIDED ON: APRIL 24, 2018**

AMAR BAHADUR

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

**THE CHAIRMAN-CUM-MANAGING
DIRECTOR, PSPCL, PATIALA
AND OTHERS**

.....RESPONDENTS

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 respondent to grant the benefit of promotional increment(s) in view of circulars dated 23.04.1990 (P-1) and 18.11.2011 (P-4) and especially in view of judgments passed by this Court in CWP No.28812 of 2017, decided on 18.12.2017, CWP No. 28849 of 2017, decided on 18.12.2017, CWP No. 29317 of 2017 decided on 21.12.2017, CWP No. 11585 of 2016, 02.06.2016 and CWP No. 20139 of 2015, decided on 29.02.2016 (P-5), consequent to which various orders passed by respondent-corporation by which the benefit of 23 years promotional increment has already been granted to the similarly situated employees along with interest @ 18% per annum from the

date when it become due till realization.

2. At the very outset of the arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner submits petitioner feels satisfied in case direction is issued to respondent(s) to decide legal notice dated 28.03.2018 (P-6), within a stipulated period.

3. Instant petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.1- Chairman-cum-Managing Director, Punjab State Power Corporation Ltd, Patiala to look into the grievances unfolded by the petitioner in legal notice dated 28.03.2018 (P-6) and to decide the same in view of circular dated 23.04.1990 (P-1) and 18.11.2011 (P-4) and especially in view of judgments passed by this Court in CWP No.28812 of 2017, decided on 18.12.2017, CWP No. 28849 of 2017, decided on 18.12.2017, CWP No. 29317 of 2017 decided on 21.12.2017, CWP No. 11585 of 2016, 02.06.2016 and CWP No. 20139 of 2015, decided on 29.02.2016 (P-5), within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. However, relief shall stand restricted to 38 months in view of Full Bench judgment of this Court in *“Saroj Kumari v. State of Punjab and others”, 1998(3) SCT 664.*

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

APRIL 24, 2018
sonika

(JASPAL SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned **Yes**

Whether reportable **Yes/No**