

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

(233)

CWP No. 10259 of 2018

Date of Decision : 12.02.2020

Sukhdev

....Petitioner

Versus

Punjab Water Resources Management and Development Corporation
Limited and others

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present:- Mr. Raman Kumar, Advocate for
Mr. Vinod K. Kaushal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sarthak Gupta, Advocate for respondents No. 1 to 3
and 5 and 6.

Ms. Anju Arora, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab
for respondent No. 4.

Harsimran Singh Sethi, J. (Oral)

The prayer of the petitioner in the present writ petition is for setting-aside the order dated 26.05.2016 (Annexure P-6) by which his claim for the grant of interest on the delayed payments has been rejected. Further prayer of the petitioner is that keeping in view the order passed by this Court in CWP No. 20201 of 2014 titled as ***Darshana Devi and others Vs. Punjab Water Resources Management and Development Corporation Limited and another***, petitioner, who is similarly situated as the petitioners

in ***Darshana Devi's case (supra)***, is entitled for interest on the delayed

release of the pensionary benefits.

Upon notice of motion, respondents have filed the reply. Though, in the reply, the respondents contested the claim of the petitioner but at the time of hearing in the Court today, learned counsel for respondents No. 1 to 3, 5 and 6 states that he has received telephonic instructions from the respondents that order dated 26.05.2016 (Annexure P-6), which has been impugned in the present writ petition by which the claim of the petitioner for the grant of interest was declined, be treated as withdrawn and the petitioner's case will be considered afresh keeping in view the order passed by this Court in ***Darshana Devi's case (supra)***. Learned counsel for the respondents states that appropriate order, after considering the case of the petitioner for the grant of interest, will be passed within a period of two months from today.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that keeping in view the statement of learned counsel for respondents No. 1 to 3 and 5 and 6, no grievance of the petitioner subsists and the present writ petition may be disposed of having been not pressed.

Ordered accordingly.

February 12, 2020
kanchan

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

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