

117 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.6764 of 2020 (O&M)
Date of decision : March 16, 2020

Ashok Kumar Parinja and others Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present:- Mr. Rakesh Sobti, Advocate for the petitioners.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI J. (ORAL)

Learned counsel for the petitioners states that the petitioners are also entitled for the grant of benefit in terms of the order passed by this Court in CWP No.2866 of 2014 titled as “*Karanvir Singh and others v State of Punjab and others*”, decided on 30.09.2016 but the said benefit is not being released to petitioners by the respondents on the ground that there is no order passed by the competent Court of law holding the petitioners entitled for the benefit as given to the petitioners in *Karanvir Singh's* case (*supra*).

Learned counsel for the petitioners argues that keeping in view the law laid down by the Division Bench of this Court in case of “*Satbir Singh v State of Haryana*” 2002(2) SCT, 354, once the question of law has been settled by this Court and the same has already attained finality, the similarly situated employees should be extended the same relief without forcing them to approach this Court but the petitioners have been forced by

the respondents for seeking the same relief, which has been extended to the similarly situated employees, who were petitioners in ***Karanvir Singh's*** case (*supra*).

The prayer of the petitioners is for issuance of a direction to the respondents to grant the benefit to the petitioners for which they are entitled in terms of the order passed by this Court in ***Karanvir Singh's*** case (*supra*).

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that for the relief which has been sought in the present writ petition, petitioners have served a legal notice dated 24.01.2020 (Annexure P-10).

Learned counsel for the petitioners further states that though, vide letter dated 28.02.2020 (Annexure P-11), respondent No.3 has responded to the legal notice by directing the petitioners to approach the D.D.O. for the revision of their pension but the D.D.O. is not revising the pension of the petitioners on the ground that there is an order passed by the competent authority in their favour. Learned counsel for the petitioner states that unless and until appropriate orders are passed by the competent authority, holding the petitioners entitled for their pension in terms of the order passed by this Court in ***Karanvir Singh's*** case (*supra*), the petitioners cannot be granted the benefit by the concerned D.D.O. Hence, he prays that petitioners will be satisfied at this stage in case a direction be issued to respondent No.1 to decide the claim of the petitioner as prayed in the legal notice dated 24.01.2020 (Annexure P-10) on merits by passing appropriate speaking order.

In view of the request made, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case or on the claim being made by the petitioners,

respondent No.1 is directed to decide the legal notice dated 24.01.2020 (Annexure P-10), by passing a speaking order within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

Present writ petition stands disposed of.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

March 16, 2020

sarita	
Whether speaking / reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable:	No