



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

210

CWP No.15890 of 1999 (O&M)
Date of decision: 04.09.2024

Madan Lal

....Petitioner

Versus

Punjab State Electricity Board and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAMIT KUMAR

Present: Mr. Anuj Raura, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. P.S. Thiara, Advocate
for the respondents.

NAMIT KUMAR J. (Oral)

Prayer in this writ petition filed by the petitioner under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, is for issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari, quashing the charge-sheet issued vide letter No.C-493 dated 24.06.1991 (Annexure P-6) qua the petitioner relating to the charges of the year 1981-82. Further a writ of mandamus has been sought for directing the respondents to release the entire amount of gratuity and commute the pension and to make the payment thereof forthwith in view of the fact that the petitioner retired from service on 31.12.1997, on attaining the age of superannuation and to direct the respondents to pay interest @ 18% per annum on the amount of gratuity, leave encashment and provident fund, which was due to be released

2024.PHHC.115265



immediately on the retirement of the petitioner i.e. 31.12.1997 as well as on the amount of commuted pension.

On 02.03.2000, the following order was passed:-

“Shri Thiara has handed over to Shri Raura two cheques – one bearing no.CA/34 147995 dated 28.2.2000 in the sum of Rs.2,01,301/- and the other bearing no.CA/34 148000 dated 1.3.2000 in the sum of Rs.1,58,707/-. This shows that substantial relief has been granted to the petitioner.

For deciding other issues, we admit the writ petition for hearing.”

Thereafter, the matter came up for hearing on 10.05.2017 and the following order was passed:-

“The learned counsel for respondents has put in appearance. It is stated that some of the retiral benefits have been paid. He seeks time to check the balance amount, if any, to be paid and inform this Court about the present status of the case on the next date of hearing.

List on 23.8.2017.”

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that despite his best efforts, he has not been able to get instructions from the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the respondents submits that no other amount is due towards the petitioner. He further submits that the petitioner has already retired from service and has unfortunately died on 27.01.2016.

In this view of the matter, the present petition is dismissed for non-prosecution.

2024.PHHC.115285



However liberty is granted to legal representatives of petitioner to revive the present petition in case any cause still survives.

(NAMIT KUMAR)
JUDGE

04.09.2024
yakub

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether reportable:	Yes/No