

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-20618-2016

Date of decision: - 28.11.2019

Pardeep Kumar

....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 as a qualifying service for computing the pensionary benefits.

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

“2. That the petitioner Pardeep Kumar has been retired from service on 31.08.2014. The following benefits have been released to the employees in the following manners: -

- (i) Pension Pay Order has been released vide PRO No.41483 dated 20.02.2015.
- (ii) Gratuity of ₹2,52,534/- on 24.02.2015 (HR Passed on

17.03.2015) and released the same vide Cheque No.484666 dated 22.04.2015.

- (iii) GPF final payment of Rs.3,97,421 vide office order of GPF Section approved on 21.10.2015 and paid by PSPCL on 10.11.2015 towards his bank account No.0732000400189615.
- (iv) Leave encashment amounting to ₹3,26,930/- has been approved on 09.09.2014 and the same has been paid by Cheque No.963529 dated 29.09.2014.
- (v) A sum of ₹1,52,613/- deposited by the petitioner vide BA 16 No.9/49938 dated 24.10.2017 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 20.06.2018 for ₹2,26,723/- and revised pension with effect of the month 04/2018.”

A bare perusal of the above would show that benefit of work charge service has been given to the petitioner and the arrears in that regard, amounting to ₹1,52,613/-, has also been paid to him.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that he does not have instructions from the petitioner regarding receiving of the amount as mentioned in the affidavit.

The respondents have stated the aforesaid facts on affidavit and the same cannot be ignored. However, the petitioner is given liberty that 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. In case, any such representation is filed by the petitioner, the respondents are directed to decide the same within a period of two months from the date of receipt of the same.

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

Ordered accordingly.

November 28, 2019
naresh.k

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?	Yes
Whether reportable?	No