

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

242

CWP-7396-2023
Decided on :26.02.2024

Vijay Kumar
... Petitioner
Versus
State of Punjab and others
... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL
PRESENT: Mr. H. S. Saini, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Neha Sonawane, DAG, Punjab.

VIKAS BAHL, J.(ORAL)

1. Present Civil Writ Petition has been filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to finalize the revised pension case of the petitioner at the earliest and release his revised pay, pension and other revised pensionary benefits.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that a part of the relief has been given to the petitioner, however, the amount of certain retiral benefits has still not been paid and has further submitted that the interest has also not been paid by the respondent-authorities. It is further submitted that the petitioner be permitted to give a detailed representation giving the details of the amount which are still due to the petitioner from the respondent-department and also giving the details of

the basis for claiming interest and at this stage, he would be satisfied, in case, the said representation is considered by the competent authority of respondent No. 1 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. Learned State Counsel has submitted that the competent authority of respondent No. 1 would consider the said representation and decide the same, 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 direction to the competent authority of respondent No 1 to consider the representation which would be filed by 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 receipt of the said representation and in case, the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious then the competent authority of respondent No. 1 would grant necessary relief immediately, in accordance with law and in case, the competent authority of respondent No. 1 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 representation.

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

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

26.02.2024
Mehak

<i>Whether reasoned/speaking?</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable?</i>	<i>Yes</i> / <i>No</i>