

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-18621-2016

Date of decision: - 28.11.2019

Chaman Lal

....Petitioner

Versus

Punjab State Power Corporation Limited and others

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present:- Mr. Aditya Dassaur, Advocate
for the petitioner.

None for the respondents.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J. (ORAL)

In the present writ petition, the grievance which is being raised by the petitioner is that he was not granted the benefit of the work charge service rendered by him, as a qualifying service while computing the pensionary benefits.

Upon notice of motion, the respondents have filed an affidavit. Relevant paragraph No.2 of the said affidavit is as under: -

“2. That the petitioner Chaman Lal has been retired from service on 31.12.2013. The following benefits have been released to the employees in the following manners: -

- (i) Pension Pay Order has been released vide PPO No.R.P.P.O. 114693/17-18 dated 28.08.2018.
- (ii) Gratuity of ₹1,66,896/- on 07.10.2014 and released the same vide Cheque No.963587 dated 04.12.2014.

- (iii) GPF final payment of ₹3,66,732/- vide office order of GPF Section O/o No.2633 dated 09.07.2014 has been passed and the same has been approved on 05.08.2014 and paid by PSPCL on 20.08.2014 towards his SBI bank account No.11427318155.
- (iv) Leave encashment amounting to ₹2,01,102/- has been approved on 09.01.2014 and the same has been paid by Cheque No.963129 dated 27.01.2014.
- (v) A sum of ₹1,59,445/- deposited by the petitioner vide BA 16 No.300/49938 dated 23.01.2018 to get his pensionary benefits by adding his work charge service into his regular service.
- (vi) After depositing the above said amount, the benefit of work charge, the service has been regularized and revised and gratuity has been paid by Pension Section, Patiala RGPO dated 26.09.2018 at for ₹1,87,758/- and revised pension with effect of the month 09/2018.”

A bare perusal of the above would show that the benefit of work charge service has been given to the petitioner and even the arrears in that regard amounting to ₹1,59,445/-, has also been paid to him.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that he has no instructions from the petitioner regarding receiving of the amount as mentioned in the affidavit.

Learned counsel for the respondents states that facts of grant of relief to the petitioner have been given on affidavit and the same cannot be ignored, however, the petitioner be given liberty in case any of the amount, as stated in the affidavit, has not been released to the petitioner, he will be at liberty to approach the respondents by filing an appropriate representation. Learned counsel for the respondents further states that in case, any such representation is filed by the petitioner, the

respondents will decide the same within a period of two months from the date of receipt of the same by passing appropriate speaking order.

Counsel for the petitioner states that in view of the above statement of learned 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 not pressed.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

November 28, 2019
naresh.k

Whether reasoned/speaking?	Yes
Whether reportable?	No