

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

211

CWP No.5040 of 2015

Date of decision: 06.03.2019

Manmohan Singh

..Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab and Ors.

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present:Mr. Vikas Chatrath, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mehardeep Singh, Addl. AG, Punjab.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J.(ORAL)

Counsel for the petitioner states that the only surviving grievance in the writ petition is that the pension of the petitioner was revised from Rs.1120 to Rs.1180 vide order dated 14.12.2012 with effect from the date when the petitioner retired i.e. 31.12.1995 but the said enhancement of the basic pay has not been reflected while calculating the pensionary benefits such as gratuity, revised pension etc.

On the other hand, counsel for the respondents states that while giving the reply to the legal notice filed by the petitioner, which has been attached Annexure P-8, the claim of the petitioner for consequential benefits on enhancement of the basic pay has already been admitted and it cannot be said that once there is an admission on behalf of the respondents about the entitlement of the petitioner, the same were not released.

Counsel for the petitioner states that keeping in view the

facts and circumstances which have been noted above, the petitioner be given liberty to approach the respondents for the redressal of his grievance claiming the revised retiral benefits upon the enhancement of the basic pay from 1120 to 1180.

Present petition is disposed of with the direction to the respondents that in case any such representation is filed by the petitioner for the benefits mentioned above, within a period of four weeks from today, the respondents shall pass appropriate orders deciding the said representation within a period of 2 months from the date of the receipt of the said representation.

In case, it is found that the petitioner is entitled for any monetary benefits, the same should also be released to him within a period of two months thereafter. The present petition is disposed off.

In respect of the late release of the DCRG respondents have already given in the reply that the petitioner only gave the option for the benefits in the year 2012 after which, the same was considered expeditiously and the benefit was granted and, therefore, no grievance can be made by the petitioner in this regard.

March 06, 2019

Poonam Sharma

**(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No