

124.

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

CWP-22760-2022

Date of Decision: 29.09.2022

PARAMJIT SINGH AND OTHERS

.... Petitioners

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present:- Mr. Baljeet Singh Sidhu, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

JAISHREE THAKUR.J (Oral)

This is a petition that has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of an appropriate writ, order or direction including a writ in the nature of Mandamus directing the respondents to count the service rendered by the petitioners on the post of SPO as qualifying service for the purpose of pensionary/retiral benefits, as the same benefit has already been granted by this Court to the similarly situated persons vide judgment dated 15.02.2018 (Annexure P-5) passed in CWP No.9936 of 2017 titled as *Sukhjeet Singh and others Versus State of Punjab and others*.

Counsel for the petitioners would submit that in this regard, the petitioners have already served a legal notice dated 14.10.2021 (Annexure P-7) upon respondent No.2, but till date no decision has been taken thereon. He would submit that at this stage, the petitioners would be satisfied in case

the said legal notice is decided, in accordance with law, in a time bound manner.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Ms. Deepali Puri, Additional Advocate General, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents and submits that the respondents will look into the matter and will take a decision on the legal notice of the petitioners.

Let sufficient number of copies of the complete paper book be supplied to her during the course of day.

Without commenting on merits of the case, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2 to decide legal notice dated 14.10.2021 (Annexure P-7) of the petitioners, within a period of six months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order, in accordance with law and convey the decision to the petitioners. In case of failure to do so, the officer responsible for the lapse would be liable to costs of Rs.20,000/- from his personal pocket, to be deposited with the Punjab and Haryana High Court Advocates Welfare Fund.

(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE

29.09.2022

sanjeev

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No