

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

(114)

CWP-9614-2024**Date of decision: - 29.04.2024****Gurmail Singh****....Petitioner****Versus****State of Punjab and others****.....Respondents****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL**

Present:- Mr. Amrik 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 praying for issuance of the writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to pay the interest @ 18% per annum on the revised gratuity as well as revised arrears of pension, which has been paid after considerable delay on 01.11.2023, in spite of the notification dated 05.07.2021 after the retirement of the petitioner on 31.12.2018.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievance raised by the petitioner, the petitioner had given a legal notice dated 15.03.2024 (Annexure P-4) and at this stage, the petitioner would be satisfied, in case, the 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 the competent authority of respondent No.1-State would consider the said legal notice dated 15.03.2024 (Annexure P-4), 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 the competent authority of respondent No.1-State to consider the said legal notice dated 15.03.2024 (Annexure P-4) 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, the 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, the 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 the competent authority of respondent No.1-State would consider and decide the matter independently, in accordance with law.

April 29, 2024

naresh.k

**(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE**

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No