

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH

\*\*\*

CWP-27556-2023

Date of decision : 08.12.2023

Davinder Lal

... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

***CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL***Present: Mr.K.K.Thakur, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr.Ferry Sofat, Addl.A.G. Punjab.

**VIKAS BAHL, J.(ORAL)**

1. This is a civil writ petition filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to consider the claim of the petitioner for revising the pension of the petitioner and to release the arrears of revised pension in terms of the judgment dated 30.09.2016 passed by this Court in CWP-2866-2014 titled as “Karanvir Singh and others vs. State of Punjab and others” and as also in view of the letter dated 04.07.2019 (Annexure P-2).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioner, the petitioner has given a legal notice dated 08.06.2023 (Annexure P-4) and at this stage, would be satisfied in case the said legal notice is considered by the competent authority of respondent no.1 in a time bound manner and if after considering the same, in case, the plea raised by the petitioner is found to be meritorious, then necessary relief be granted to the petitioner.

3. Learned State counsel has submitted that the competent authority of respondent no.1 would consider the said legal notice and decide the same within a period of two months from the date of the receipt of certified copy of the present 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 legal notice dated 08.06.20203 (P-4) of the petitioner and decide the same, in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of two months from the date of the receipt of certified copy of the present order and in case, after considering the same, the plea of the petitioner is found to be meritorious, then necessary relief be granted to the petitioner and in case, the plea of the petitioner is not found to be meritorious, then a speaking order rejecting the same be passed within a period of two months from the date of the receipt of certified copy of the present order.
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 legal notice independently, in accordance with law.

(VIKAS BAHL)  
JUDGE

**December 08, 2023.**  
*Davinder Kumar*

|                             |        |
|-----------------------------|--------|
| Whether speaking / reasoned | Yes/No |
| Whether reportable          | Yes/No |