

112

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

CWP-9140-2024

Date of decision: 24.04.2024

Rajinder Singh Saini

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL**

Present: Mr. Jatinder Pal Singh, 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 for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to release Regular Pension, DCRG (Gratuity) in view of Rule 2.2(c) read with explanation of Rule 2.2(b), and commutation of pension in view of Chapter 11, Rule 11.1 of Punjab Civil Services Rules, Volume-II, Rule 9.9 of Punjab Civil Rules Volume-II, Rule 8.21(aa) of Punjab Civil Rules Volume-I and the law settled by the larger bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioner in the present writ petition, the petitioner had given representation dated 15.11.2023 (Annexure P-13) 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 dated 15.11.2023

(Annexure P-13) 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-State would consider the said representation dated 15.11.2023 (Annexure P-13), in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of two months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the present order.

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-State to consider representation dated 15.11.2023 (Annexure P-13), in accordance with law, within a period of two months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the present order and in case, the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious, then, the competent authority would grant necessary relief, 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 certified copy of the present order.

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.

**24.04.2024**

*Pawan*

**Whether speaking/reasoned:-  
Whether reportable:-**

**(VIKAS BAHL)  
JUDGE**

**Yes/No  
Yes/No**