

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

**CWP-18390-2020
Date of Decision: 28.04.2022**

Krishna Devi

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. Gagneshwar Walia, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Anju Sharma Kaushik, DAG, Punjab.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI J. (ORAL)

The present petition has been filed for release of the retiral benefits, for which the petitioner became entitled for, upon her retirement by the respondents.

Upon notice of motion, reply has been filed on behalf of the respondents, wherein it has been stated that an amount of Rs.7,44,789/- has already been released in favour of the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the petitioner concedes the factum that the amount of retiral benefits, for which the petitioner is entitled for, has already been released in her favour but as there is a delay in release of the said payments to the petitioner by the respondents, it gives liberty to the petitioner to approach the respondents by filing appropriate representation,

so as to claim interest on the said delayed payments keeping in view the settled principle of law laid down by the Full Bench of this Court while passing judgment in “A.S. Randhawa Vs. State of Punjab and others”, 1997(3) SCT 468, according to which, an employee who has not been released the pensionary benefits within a period of two months from superannuation, in case there is no impediment, becomes entitled for the grant of interest for the delay in releasing of the pensionary benefits.

Learned State counsel submits that in case any such representation is filed by the petitioner with the respondents, the same will be dealt with in accordance with law by the authorities concerned and an appropriate speaking order will be passed within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of any such representation.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that keeping in view the aforesaid submissions of learned State counsel, no further grievance of the petitioner survives in the present petition at this stage, and therefore, the same may kindly be disposed of as having been not pressed any further at this stage with the liberty as prayed for.

Ordered accordingly.

28.04.2022

Apurva

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)

JUDGE

1. Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes
2. Whether reportable : No