

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

CWP-13155-2020

Date of decision: 31.8.2020

Ram Kishan

...Petitioner

Versus

Managing Director, Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Limited and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr.Sandeep Thakan, Advocate for the petitioner

JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J.

The matter has been taken up through video-conferencing in the light of the pandemic Covid-19 situation and as per instructions.

This writ petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India has been filed for issuance of direction to the respondents to step up the pay of the petitioner at par with one Harish Chander, junior to him w.e.f. 1.7.2010 in view of the instructions dated 12.9.2018 (Annexure P2) and release all the consequential benefits accrued in favour of the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that the case of the petitioner is covered by the judgment dated 28.3.2016 passed in CWP-10885-2014 titled as “Khem Chand vs. Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Limited and others”. At this stage, he would be satisfied, if a direction is issued to respondent No. 1- Managing Director, Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Limited, Panchkula to consider and decide the legal notice dated 2.3.2020 (Annexure P-7) in the light of the said judgment, expeditiously.

Heard.

In view of the above, without adverting to the merits of the case, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No. 1- Managing Director, Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Limited, Panchkula to consider and decide the legal notice dated 2.3.2020 (Annexure P-7) in the light of the judgment dated 28.3.2016 passed in CWP-10885-2014 titled as “Khem Chand vs. Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Limited and others” in accordance with law within six weeks from the date of receipt of the certified copy of the judgment. In case, on consideration, the competent authority reaches to the conclusion that the benefit claimed by the petitioner is admissible to him, in such eventuality, the consequential relief be allowed to him, within a period of six weeks thereafter. However, in case the competent authority feels that the relief claimed by the petitioner is not admissible or made out, in that case, a speaking order be passed in the matter.

31.8.2020
gsv

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking / reasoned?
Whether reportable?

Yes / No
Yes / No