

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

COCP No. 889 of 2016
Date of decision: 16.10.2019

Kulwant Singh

.. Petitioner

v.

R. Ventakraman and others

.. Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. Harnek Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Aditya Sharda, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

...

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J. (Oral)

The writ petition filed by the petitioner seeking direction for payment of interest on delayed payment of retiral benefits was disposed of on 30.11.2015 with the direction to the respondents to decide the legal notice dated 10.9.2015. It was further ordered that in case there was delay, the petitioner shall be entitled to interest @ 9% per annum from the date the amount became due till the date of payment.

The present contempt petition was filed pleading that needful has not been done.

Pursuant to notice of motion, the respondents produced order dated 29.1.2016 whereby the claim of the petitioner for interest was rejected. As the respondents were not in a position to defend rejection of interest, time was sought.

Today additional affidavit dated 15.10.2019 of Mr. Inderjeet Singh Chawla, General Manager, Punjab Roadways, Ludhiana filed in court is taken on record, copy handed over to learned counsel for the petitioner. Along with the affidavit, order dated 4.10.2019 is annexed whereby the petitioner has been held entitled to interest to the tune of ₹26,731/-.

Learned counsel for the State, on instructions from Mr. Gurpreet Singh, IAS, Director, State Transport, Punjab submits that the petitioner was given cheque of the said amount but he refused to receive the same.

In view of the order passed, no further interference is called for in the contempt proceedings. However, the petitioner can collect the cheque from the office of the respondents on any working day.

The contempt petition is dismissed.

However, it is clarified that in case the petitioner is aggrieved of calculation of amount, he would be at liberty to avail remedies available in accordance with law.

It is pertinent to mention here that rather than giving instructions in advance to learned counsel for the State, six officers are present in court including a Law Officer. It is unfortunate that the officials dealing with the public are present in the Court in group making their office work and public to suffer. Learned counsel for the State undertakes that needful will be done to ensure that this is not repeated in future.

(AVNEESH JHINGAN)
JUDGE

16.10.2019
mk

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether reportable: Yes/No

