

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

(116)

CWP-8623-2024

Date of decision: - 19.04.2024

Lakhwinder Singh**....Petitioner****Versus****The Secretary Public Works Department and others****.....Respondents****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL**

Present:- Ms. Ravanjot Kaur, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. TPS Walia, AAG, Punjab.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. This is a Civil Writ Petition filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India seeking issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents No.1 to 4 to release his retirement/pensionary benefits as per the 6th Pay Commission along with interest on the delayed payments.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioner, the petitioner had given a legal notice dated 26.10.2023 (Annexure P-1) and at this stage, the petitioner would be satisfied, in case, competent authority of respondent No.1-State considers the same, in accordance with law, within a specified time frame and in case, the plea raised by the petitioner is found to be meritorious, then, grant the appropriate relief to the petitioner.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the respondents-State has

submitted that competent authority of respondent No.1-State would consider the said legal notice dated 26.10.2023 (Annexure P-1), filed by the petitioner, in accordance with law and the same would be done within a period of six weeks from the date of certified copy of this order.

4. Keeping in view the above-said facts and circumstances, the present petition is disposed of, with a direction to competent authority of respondent No.1-State to consider the legal notice dated 26.10.2023 (Annexure P-1) filed by the petitioner within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of the certified copy of this order and in case, competent authority of respondent No.1-State is of the view that the plea raised by the petitioner is meritorious, then, the appropriate relief be granted to the petitioner, as expeditiously as possible. In case, competent authority of respondent No.1-State is of the view that the plea raised by the petitioner is meritless, then, a speaking order rejecting the claim be passed within the aforesaid period of six weeks.

5. It is made clear that this Court has not opined on the merits of the case and competent authority of respondent No.1-State would consider and decide the matter independently, in accordance with law.

April 19, 2024

naresh.k

**(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE**

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No