

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

(129)

CWP-25055-2023

Date of decision: - 06.11.2023

Mander Singh**....Petitioner****Versus****State of Punjab and others****.....Respondents****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL**

Present:- Mr. Anshuman Chopra, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Ferry Sofat, Additional Advocate General, Punjab.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. Present writ petition has been filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the official respondents to release the pensionary benefits of the petitioner.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances of the petitioner, the petitioner has given a detailed representation (Annexure P-3) and the petitioner would be satisfied in case the competent authority of respondent No.1 considers the same in accordance with law, within a specified time frame and in case the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious, then, grant the appropriate relief.

3. Learned State counsel has submitted that the competent authority of respondent No.1 would consider the said representation dated

(Annexure P-3), filed by the petitioner, in accordance with law and the same would be done within a period of two months from the date of certified copy of this order.

4. Keeping in view the above-said facts and circumstances, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to the competent authority of respondent No.1 to consider the representation (Annexure P-3) filed by the petitioner within a period of two months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order and in case the competent authority of respondent No.1 is of the view that the pleas raised by the petitioner are meritorious, then, the necessary relief be granted to the petitioner within a period of one month thereafter. In case the competent authority of the respondent authorities is of the view that the pleas raised by the petitioner are meritless, then, a speaking order rejecting the claim be passed within the aforesaid period of two months.

5. It is made clear that this Court has not opined on the merits of the case and the competent authority of respondent No.1 would consider and decide the matter independently, in accordance with law.

November 06, 2023
naresh.k

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No