

202

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-14771-2000 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 18.01.2024

Krishan Kaur

. . . . Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

. . . . Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA

Present: None for the petitioner.

Mr. Vishnav Gandhi, DAG, Punjab.

SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA, J.(Oral)

1. No one appears for the petitioner. This is a writ petition of the year 2000 and more than 20 years have elapsed. The same is therefore taken up for hearing.
2. The petitioner is claiming salary and retiral benefits of the post of Development Officer (Women Programme) while the respondents have retired her as Mukh Sevika. It is her case that she was promoted as Mukh Sevika on 07.05.1976. Vide order dated 08.04.1999, she was given current duty charge to the post of Development Officer (Women Programme) in her own pay scale, and she joined on 30.04.1999 as Development Officer (Women Programme) at Sangrur. She worked on the said post till she retired on 31.05.2000. The claim set up by the petitioner is that as she was holding the post of Development Officer (Women Programme) on the date of retirement, she should be treated as having retired from the said post and therefore she would be entitled to the pension of the said post.

- 3. I have considered the submissions.
- 4. The claim of the petitioner is wholly frivolous. The petitioner was only given additional charge and she has worked only for a small period of one year and one month on the said post of Development Officer (Women Programme). The directions were for holding the current duty charge in her own pay scale, as has been pointed out by the respondents in their reply.
- 5. In view thereof, she cannot be said to have been retired from the substantive post of Development Officer (Women Programme), and her retirement has to be treated from her substantive post of Mukh Sevika and pension would be admissible to her only for the post of Mukh Sevika. The claim of the petitioner to fix her pension and retiral benefits on the pay of Development Officer (Women Programme) is therefore found to be misconceived.
- 6. Writ Petition stands *dismissed* accordingly.
- 7. All pending applications also stand disposed of.

(SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA)
JUDGE

January 18, 2024

Mohit goyal

- | | |
|-------------------------------|--------|
| 1. Whether speaking/reasoned? | Yes/No |
| 2. Whether reportable? | Yes/No |