

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

CWP No. 21600 of 2021

DATE OF DECISION :- October 27, 2021

Dalip Kumar and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. MADAAN

Present:- Mr. Inderjit Sharma, Advocate for the petitioners.

Ms. Anju Sharma Kaushik, DAG, Punjab.

The case has been taken up through Video Conferencing.

Petitioners Dalip Kumar and eight others, all of them, working as drivers with different Sugar Mills in State of Punjab are praying for release of special pay allowance at the rate of Rs.700/- per month w.e.f 5.9.2008 and enhanced special pay allowance at the rate of Rs.1400/- per month w.e.f 1.10.2010 in terms of government Notification dated 5.7.2011 (Annexure P-11) as well as conveyance allowance which is being paid to similarly situated employees working in the office of respondents who have been granted benefit in terms of direction issued in CWP No. 19431 of 2014 titled 'Malkiat Singh and others versus State of Punjab and others' decided on 19.8.2016 (Annexure P-16). According to the petitioners they had submitted representation (Annexure P-12) to the respondents but that has not evoked any response necessitating the filing of the present writ petition.

Mr. Rishab Gupta, Advocate has put in appearance for

respondent No. 3. Learned counsel for the petitioners state that he would be satisfied if a direction is issued to the respondents more particularly respondent No. 3 to decide the representation of the petitioners in a time bound manner. Learned counsel for respondent No. 3 states that any such direction issued by the Court in that regard would be duly complied with.

Keeping in view the nature of the dispute between the parties as well as prayer made by the petitioners, for the purpose of enabling the respondents to consider the claim of petitioners and then to take appropriate action, if need be and further to avoid unnecessary litigation, the writ petition is disposed of directing respondent No. 3 to consider the representation (Annexure P-12) of the petitioners in accordance with law, rules, regulations and instructions on the subject within a period of two months from the date of receipt of copy of the order and if some action in the matter is warranted then the needful be done in accordance with law. A speaking order in that regard be passed, which be conveyed to the petitioners. If the petitioners feel dissatisfied after passing of the order then they may approach the Court again in accordance with law.

(H.S. MADAAN)
JUDGE

October 27, 2021

p.singh

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No