

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

(1)

**CWP No. 10365 of 2019
Date of Decision : 16.05.2019**

Hardeep Singh and others

...Petitioners

Versus

Pepsu Road Transport Corporation

...Respondent

(2)

CWP No. 6269 of 2018

Surjit Singh and others

...Petitioners

Versus

Pepsu Road Transport Corporation

...Respondent

(3)

CWP No. 11385 of 2019

Rajwinder Singh and others

...Petitioners

Versus

Pepsu Road Transport Corporation

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Ms. Anureet Budwal, Advocate for
Mr. Vikas Chatrath, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Aman Sharma, Advocate for the respondent.

Harsimran Singh Sethi, J.(Oral)

By this common order, three writ petition are being decided as they involve common question of law and similar facts.

The grievance which is being raised is that the total service rendered by the petitioner(s) has not been taken into account as a qualifying service for the grant of pensionary benefits.

Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) argues that only the service for which the CPF was deducted, has been taken into account as a qualifying service for the grant of pensionary benefits. Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) further argues that in the writ petitions filed against respondent-Corporation, Rule 6(1) of the Pepsu Road Transport Corporation Employees (Pension and Gratuity) General Provident Fund, 1992 has been interpreted and it has been held that the total service rendered by an employee is to be taken into account as a qualifying service for the grant of pensionary benefits subject to the conditions mentioned therein. Reliance is being placed by the counsel for the petitioner(s) in CWP No. 24543 of 2016, decided on 27.11.2018. Counsel for the petitioners argues that the petitioners herein are similarly situated as the petitioner in CWP No. 24543 of 2016 and the question of law raised in the present writ petition already stands answered by this Court while deciding the said writ petition.

Learned counsel for the respondents states that though reply has only been filed in CWP No. 6269 of 2018 but he has clear instructions from the respondents imparted to him vide letter dated 16.05.2019 that these writ petitions are covered by CWP No. 8285 of 2004 titled as ***Ved Parkash Vs. The State of Punjab and others*** and CWP No. 24543 of 2016 titled

Gurdial Singh and others Vs. Pepsu Road Transport Corporation and others, (Annexures P-1 and P-5) respectively and he states that the respondents have no objection in case the present writ petitions are also disposed of in same terms as CWP No. 24543 of 2016, decided on 27.11.2018.

Keeping in view the request made by learned counsel for the parties, all the three writ petitions are also disposed of in terms of CWP No. 24543 of 2016, decided on 27.11.2018.

May 16, 2019
kanchan

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned? Yes
Whether reportable? No