

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

CWP-27945-2023

Date of decision : 13.12.2023

Khazan Singh Minhas

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr.Pawan Kumar Goklaney, 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 an appropriate writ, order or direction especially in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to grant difference of arrears of salary and pensionary benefits w.e.f. 01.01.2016 to 30.06.2021 in view of the recommendations of 6th Pay Commission.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioner, the petitioner has given a legal notice dated 12.10.2023 (Annexure P-1) to the respondents and at this stage, would be satisfied in case the competent authority of respondent no.1 considers the said legal notice 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 legal notice and decide the

same within a period of 3 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 12.10.2023 (Annexure P-1) of the petitioner and decide the same, in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of 3 months from the date of the receipt of certified copy of the present order and in case, after considering the same, the plea raised by the petitioner is found to be meritorious, then necessary relief be granted to the petitioner and in case, the plea raised by the petitioner is not found to be meritorious, then a speaking order rejecting the same be passed within a period of 3 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 13, 2023.

Davinder Kumar

Whether speaking / reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No