

121

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

CWP-28330-2023

Date of decision: 18.12.2023

Ajay Verma

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Puneet Kumar Bansal, 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 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to pay interest as per the provisions of General Provident Fund Rules on delayed deposit of Provident Fund from the date the said amount was deducted every month from the salary till its actual deposit by Municipal Council, Ferozepur City.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioner in the present writ petition, the petitioner had given legal notice dated 07.11.2023 (Annexure P-5) and he would be satisfied at this stage, in case, respondent No.3-Municipal Council, Ferozepur City is directed to consider the said legal notice dated 07.11.2023

(Annexure P-5) in a time bound manner and in case, the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious then to grant necessary relief in accordance with law.

3. Mr. Ferry Sofat, Addl. A.G. Punjab, appears and accepts notice on behalf of respondent Nos.1 to 3 and has submitted that respondent No.3 would consider the said legal notice dated 07.11.2023 (Annexure P-5) in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible preferably within a period of two months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the present order.

4. Keeping in view the abovesaid facts and circumstances, the present Civil Writ Petition is disposed of with direction to respondent No.3 to consider legal notice dated 07.11.2023 (Annexure P-5) in accordance with law within a period of two months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the present order and in case, the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious then respondent No.3 would grant necessary relief, in accordance with law and in case, respondent No.3 is of the opinion that the pleas raised by the petitioner are not meritorious then a speaking order rejecting the same be passed within a period of two months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the present order.

5. This Court has not opined on the merits of the case and respondent No.3 would consider the case of the petitioner independently, in accordance with law.

18.12.2023

Pawan

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:-

Yes/No

Whether reportable:-

Yes/No