

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 4226 of 2017

Date of Decision : 02.04.2019

Paramjit Kaur

...Petitioner

Versus

Punjab State Warehousing corporation and another

...Respondents

CORAM: *HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI*

Present: Ms. Jagdeep Bains, Advocate with
Mr. Tahaf Bains, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Vikas Singh, Advocate for the respondents.

Harsimran Singh Sethi, J.(Oral)

In the present writ petition, the grievance raised by the petitioner is in respect to the order dated 27.05.2014 (Annexure P-1) by which recovery amounting to ₹1,52,942.37 was imposed upon the late husband of the petitioner. Not only this, vide order dated 09.04.2013 (Annexure P-6), a recovery of ₹5,38,501/- was also imposed.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that both the impugned orders have already been withdrawn by the respondents and the benefits, in respect of the service rendered by the late husband of the petitioner, have already been released to the petitioner as stated by the respondents in their written statement, which is duly supported by Annexure R-1. Learned counsel for the petitioner further states that the petitioner was entitled for

these amounts immediately when her husband died in October, 2009 but the same have only been released vide Annexure R-1 in the year 2016 and, therefore, the petitioner is entitled for the interest on the said payment. Learned counsel for the petitioner seeks liberty to approach the respondents in this regard by filing an appropriate representation by giving all the facts and details as well as the settled principle of law entitling the petitioner for interest on the delayed payments.

Learned counsel for the respondents very fairly states that in case any representation is filed by the petitioner in this regard, the same will be duly considered and appropriate orders will be passed in this regard within a period of two months from the receipt of the said representation.

Keeping in view the statement given by learned counsel for the respondent, learned counsel for the petitioner states that she does not wish to press the writ petition any further at this stage.

The writ petition is disposed of having not being pressed.

April 02, 2019
kanchan

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned? *Yes/No*
Whether reportable? *Yes/No*