

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-18734-2019

Date of decision: - 12.07.2019

Saroj Kumari

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present:- Mr. Jagdish Manchanda, Advocate
for the petitioner.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J. (ORAL)

Counsel for the petitioner argues that late husband of the petitioner was appointed as a Taxation Inspector alongwith Sh. Rohtan Singh, Sh. Arun Kumar Gautam, Sh. Somnath, Sh. Sham Sunder Kalra, Sh. Ram Singh and Sh. Karamjeet Singh on 03.09.1990. Husband of the petitioner continued working with the respondents, when unfortunately he died while in service in the year 1991.

Counsel for the petitioner argues that a claim was made by Sh. Rohtan Singh, Sh. Arun Kumar Gautam, Sh. Somnath, Sh. Sham Sunder Kalra, Sh. Ram Singh and Sh. Karamjeet Singh that they should be granted the appointment as Taxation Inspectors w.e.f. 22.09.1986 when the other employees selected with them had joined and their pay should be fixed notionally from the said date. The said benefit has been granted to them by the respondents on 30.01.2013 (Annexure P-8) and

they have been treated to be in service w.e.f. 22.09.1986 instead of 03.09.1990 when they had actually joined.

Counsel for the petitioner argues that even husband of the petitioner was entitled for the said benefit and therefore, in case the late husband of the petitioner is also given appointment as a Taxation Officer w.e.f. 22.09.1986, as given to other similarly situated employees, petitioner will be entitled for the higher family pension and other benefits.

Counsel for the petitioner submits that for the relief which has been sought in the present writ petition, petitioner has submitted a representation dated 15.07.2013 (Annexure P-11) with the respondents, which is still pending consideration with the respondents and the petitioner will be satisfied, at this stage, in case a time bound direction is issued to the respondents to decide the said representation.

In view of the request made, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case or the claim being made by the petitioner, the respondents are directed to decide the representation dated 15.07.2013 (Annexure P-11) by passing a speaking order within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order. In case after the decision, it is found that the petitioner is entitled for any monetary benefit, the same shall also be released to her within a period of next three months.

Present writ petition stands disposed of.

July 12, 2019
naresh.k

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?

Yes

Whether reportable?	No
---------------------	----