

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

Subhash ChanderPetitioner
Vs
Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Ltd. and others
.....Respondents

[2]. Along with the replication filed by the petitioner, the petitioner has annexed the order dated 28.11.2016 and contends that vide the aforesaid order, it has been decided by the respondent-Nigam to count the period of service rendered by the petitioner in the work-charge capacity w.e.f. 14.11.1968

to 05.02.1985 except EOL 268 days, which has been tabulated in the earlier part of the order towards pensionary benefits subject to the condition to deposit EPF amount (employee/employer share) along with upto date interest.

[3]. Even according to the learned counsel for the respondents, though the order was passed on 28.11.2016, but the petitioner has not complied with the same till date.

[4]. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the cause being recurring in nature, the petitioner shall do the needful in the context of order dated 28.11.2016 within a period of one month.

[5]. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that on making the compliance of the order dated 28.11.2016 by the petitioner, needful in the context of counting the period of service in the work-charge capacity w.e.f. 14.11.968 to 05.02.1985 except EOL 268 days, shall be done by the competent authority within a further period of one month.

[6]. In view of consensus arrived at between the parties, this writ petition is disposed of.

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

12.01.2023

Prince

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No