

256
IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-7571-2023
Date of decision: 07.05.2024

Ranjit Singh
...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others
...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Vikrant Koundal, Advocate for
Mr. R.V.S. Chugh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Neha Sonawane, DAG, Punjab.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. This is a Civil Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for the issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to pay the interest @ 18% per annum from the due date on the delayed payment of arrears of pensionary benefits of the petitioner.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioner in the present writ petition, the petitioner would give a detailed representation to the competent authority of respondent No.1-State and he would be satisfied at this stage, in case, the competent authority of respondent No.1-State is directed to consider the said representation in a time bound manner and in case, the pleas raised by

the petitioner are found to be meritorious, then, to grant necessary relief immediately thereafter, in accordance with law.

3. Learned State Counsel has submitted that the competent authority of respondent No.1-State would consider the abovesaid representation, in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of two months from the date of receipt of the said representation.

4. Keeping in view the abovesaid facts and circumstances, the present Civil Writ Petition is disposed of with a direction to the competent authority of respondent No.1-State to consider the abovesaid representation, in accordance with law, within a period of two months from the date of receipt of the abovesaid representation and in case, the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious, then, the competent authority would grant necessary relief immediately thereafter, in accordance with law and in case, the competent authority 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 the said representation.

5. This Court has not opined on the merits of the case and the competent authority of respondent No.1-State would consider the case of the petitioner independently, in accordance with law.

07.05.2024
Pawan

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:- **Yes/No**

Whether reportable:- **Yes/No**