

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

(131)

CWP No. 34917-2019

Date of Decision : 02.12.2019

Vinod Kumar

....Petitioner

Versus

The Punjab State Power Corporation Limited and others

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present:- Mr. J.S. Jaidka, Advocate for the petitioner.

Harsimran Singh Sethi, J. (Oral)

Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that petitioner had initially joined on work-charge basis in Anandpur Sahib Hydel Project on 01.12.1981, which project was under the Irrigation Department of Government of Punjab at the relevant time but subsequently was taken over by the Punjab State Electricity Board. Learned counsel argues that petitioner continued working in Anandpur Sahib Hydel Project till 30.06.1985 when he was retrenched from service. After being retrenched from service, petitioner joined the Punjab State Electricity Board on daily wage basis again in the year 1985 and the services of the petitioner were made work charge on 26.05.1998 and ultimately, his services were regularized by the respondents. Petitioner retired from service on attaining

the age of superannuation on 31.05.2019. The grievance of the petitioner is

that the benefit of service which he had rendered from 01.12.1981 till 30.06.1985 and further from the year 1985 till 1998 has not been counted as a qualifying service for computing the pensionary benefits. The prayer of the petitioner is for issuance of a direction to the respondents to grant him the benefit of service, which he had rendered from 01.12.1981 till 30.06.1985 in Anandpur Sahib Hydel Project and further from the year 1985 till the regularization of his services with the Punjab State Electricity Board.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that for the relief, which has been claimed in the present writ petition, petitioner has submitted a representation dated 29.06.2019 (Annexure P-6) with the respondents, which is still pending consideration with the respondents and the petitioner will be satisfied, at this stage, in case a time bound direction is issued to the respondents to decide the said representation.

In view of the request made, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case and the claim being made by the petitioner, the respondents are directed to decide the representation dated 29.06.2019 (Annexure P-6) by passing a speaking order within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

Writ petition stands disposed of accordingly.

December 02, 2019
kanchan

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

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