

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-29577-2019

Date of decision: - 15.10.2019

Satbir Singh and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present:- None for the petitioners.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J. (ORAL)

Petitioners have approached this Court seeking grant of the increment for the service, which they had rendered continuously for a period of one year before they superannuated.

As per the averments made in the writ petition, benefit of increment has not been allowed to the petitioners on the ground that on the date of grant of increment, the petitioners were not in service and therefore, they have not been granted the benefit of one increment though they had rendered one year service prior to their retirement. Counsel for the petitioners argues that denial of increment, for which they are entitled for, is contrary to the law laid by the judgment of Madras High Court in case **W.P. No.15732 of 2017** titled as '**P. Ayyamperumal Vs. The Registrar, Central Administrative Tribunal and others**', decided on

15.09.2017 (Annexure P-2), which has been upheld by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India.

From the pleadings, it transpires that for the relief which has been claimed in the present writ petition, petitioners have submitted a representation dated 28.06.2019 (Annexure P-1) which is still pending consideration with the respondents.

Interest of justice will be served, at this stage, in case a time bound direction is issued to the respondents to decide the claim of the petitioners raised in the representation dated 28.06.2019 (Annexure P-1).

Without commenting upon the merits of the case or about the entitlement of the petitioners for the relief, which has been claimed by them in the representation dated 28.06.2019 (Annexure P-1), the present writ petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondents to decide the representation dated 28.06.2019 (Annexure P-1) within a period of three months from the receipt of copy of this order. In case, it is found that the petitioners are entitled for any monetary benefits after the decision of the representation, the same should also be paid to them within three months thereafter.

Present writ petition stands disposed of.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

October 15, 2019
naresh.k

Whether reasoned/speaking?	Yes
Whether reportable?	No