

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.10245 of 2018
DATE OF DECISION:30.01.2019

Surat Chander

... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

CWP No.14792 of 2018

Parvesh Chander

... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

CWP No.13744 of 2018

Kishori Lal

... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

CWP No.14234 of 2018

Parveen Lata

... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

CWP No.10366 of 2018

Nathanial

... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Punjab and another

... Respondents

CWP No.11706 of 2018

Tarsem Lal

... Petitioner

Versus

The Secretary, Department of Local Government, Punjab and others

... Respondents

CWP No.12658 of 2018

Ashok Kumar

... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

CWP No.13090 of 2018

Pritam Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

CWP No.13119 of 2018

Davinder Kaur

... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

CWP No.12806 of 2018

Raj Kumar

... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. G.P. Vashisht, Advocate
Mr. Vipin Mahajan, Advocate
Ms. Sunakshi Sharma, Advocate for
Mr. Vikram Anand, Advocate
Ms. Jasleen Kaur, Advocate for
Mr. Vikas Chatrath, Advocate
Mr. G.S. Sandhu, Advocate
Mr. Sunny Singla, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mehardeep Singh, Additional Advocate General,
Punjab.

Mr. Joginder Sharma, Advocate
for respondent No.4 in CWP No.11706 of 2018.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J. (ORAL)

By this order, the abovementioned writ petitions will be
disposed of as they involve the same questions of law as to whether
the employee is entitled for interest on delayed payment of pension

and pensionary benefits.

Counsel for the petitioners states that the retiral benefits were released by the respondents after the delay and that too unexplained and, therefore, the petitioners are entitled for interest in view of the settled principles of law laid down by Full Bench of this Court in the case of **A.S. Randhawa Vs. State of Punjab 1997(3) SCT 468**.

Counsel for the petitioners further states that for the relief which is being sought in the present writ petition, the petitioners have filed representations/legal notice(s) with the respondents giving the details as to on which date, the amount became due and when the same was released by the respondents.

Counsel for the petitioners states that the said representations/legal notice(s) are still pending consideration with the respondents and no order is being passed by the respondents without any valid justification. They pray that the respondents be directed to decide their representations/legal notice in a time bound manner.

Counsel for the respondents-State has no objection to consider the representations and pass a speaking order in every case and assures that the decision rendered by Full Bench of this Court in **A.S. Randhawa's case** mentioned above will be kept in mind while passing the speaking order.

In view of the above, the present writ petitions are disposed of with the directions to the respondents to decide the representations/legal notice(s) as the case may be by passing

appropriate speaking orders within the period of three months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order. In case after passing the order, it is found that the petitioners are entitled for interest as per the settled principles of law, the same should be calculated @ 9% per annum and the same shall be given to the petitioners within a period of three months thereafter.

The writ petitions stands disposed of in the above terms.

January 30, 2019
jt

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

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