

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-17557 of 2014

Date of decision: 26.09.2019

Karnail Kaur

.... Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab and another

.... Respondents

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. Dinesh Kumar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. H.S. Sitta AAG, Punjab.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J. .

In the present writ petition, the challenge is to order dated 04.03.2014 (Annexure P/32), by which the claim of the petitioner for counting her past service rendered from 02.06.1988 to 27.04.1995 as qualifying service for grant of pensionary benefits, was declined.

Counsel for the petitioner argues that during the pendency of the present writ petition, the respondents have reconsidered the case of the petitioner and found that the petitioner is entitled for counting her past service rendered from 02.06.1988 to 27.04.1995 as qualifying service for grant of pensionary benefits. After deciding the said issue, the petitioner was asked to deposit the contribution for the said period, which included the contribution of employee as well as of employer. Though, the petitioner raised an objection for depositing the contribution of the employer but under

protest had deposited the total amount. Counsel for the petitioner argues that now vide order dated 15.07.2019, the respondents after reconsideration held that the petitioner was wrongly asked to deposit a sum of Rs.55,803/- as share of the employer and the same is liable to be refunded to the petitioner, thus, no further grievance of the petitioner subsists except directing the respondents to implement order dated 15.07.2019 for refund of amount of Rs.55,803/- to the petitioner in a time bound manner.

Counsel for the respondents states that in case the said amount has not been already refunded to the petitioner, the same will be refunded within a period of one month from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

Counsel for the petitioner states that in view of the statement made by counsel for the respondents, he does not wish to press the present writ petition any further and the same may be disposed of as such.

Disposed of as having been not pressed.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)

26.09.2019

JUDGE

<i>aarti</i> 1.	Whether speaking/non-speaking?	Yes/No
2.	Whether reportable?	Yes/No