

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-10104-2017

Date of decision: - 14.03.2019

Surinder Singh Kalra

...Petitioner

Versus

Union of India and others

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present:- Mr. Parveen K. Kataria, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Karan Singh, Advocate
for respondents No.1 and 2.

Mr. R.N. Lohan, Advocate
for respondent No.3.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J. (ORAL)

In the present writ petition, the grievance which is being raised by the petitioner is that the respondents should revise his salary from November, 2007 to June, 2010 and grant him the arrears of the same alongwith interest.

As per the averments made in the writ petition, the petitioner, who was working in the Punjab & Sind Bank, was sent on deputation as a Recovery Officer in DRT-II, Chandigarh w.e.f. 07.06.2007 for a period of three years and his salary was to be paid as fixed by the respondents keeping in view Circular/Office Memorandum dated 05.01.1994.

While the petitioner was on deputation, the salary of the

Bank employees were revised from November, 2007 onwards in view of the tripartite agreement, but as the petitioner was working with the Debt Recovery Tribunal, the said benefit was not extended to him. Thereafter, the petitioner was implicated in a corruption case by the CBI for which he was convicted and the appeal against the said conviction is pending. By this writ petition, the petitioner is claiming the difference of salary for the period for which he served DRT-II, Chandigarh i.e. from November, 2007 to June 2010.

Upon notice of motion, written statement has been filed on behalf of respondent No.3 today in the Court and the same is taken on record. A copy thereof has been supplied to counsel for the petitioner.

In the written statement filed by respondent No.3, it has been stated that salary of the petitioner has already been refixed w.e.f. 06.06.2007 and an order dated 19.06.2017 (Annexure R-3/1) to this effect has already been passed.

Counsel for the respondents states that in view of the above-said fact, the present writ petition has been rendered infructuous.

Counsel for the petitioner states that the benefits, as asked in the present writ petition by the petitioner except interest, has already been paid to him and for the grant of interest, the petitioner be given liberty to approach the respondents by filing an appropriate representation.

In view of the request made, liberty is granted to the petitioner to file a representation in case he wishes to seek interest from the respondents on the payment, which has been released to him in the year 2017 and if any such representation is filed by the petitioner, the

respondents shall pass the appropriate speaking orders considering the same in view the settled principle of law, within a period of two months from the date of receipt of the same.

Keeping in view above, counsel for the petitioner states he does not want to press the present writ petition any further and the same may be disposed of as such.

Disposed of, as not pressed.

March 14, 2019
naresh.k

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?	Yes
Whether reportable?	No