

CWP-11902-2024

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(113)

CWP-11902-2024

Date of decision: - 21.05.2024

Jagdish Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present:- Mr. Rajeev Dev Sharma, 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 the issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to release the arrears of revised pension on account of implementation of 6th Punjab Pay Commission, 2016 along with all the consequent benefits and adequate interest on delayed payment.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioner, the petitioner had given a representation dated 04.03.2024 (Annexure P-5) 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 pleas raised by the petitioner are

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 representation dated 04.03.2024 (Annexure P-5), filed by the petitioner, in accordance with law and the same would be done within a period of two months 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 representation dated 04.03.2024 (Annexure P-5) filed by the petitioner within a period of two months 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 pleas raised by the petitioner are 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 pleas raised by the petitioner are meritless, then, a speaking order rejecting the claim be passed within the aforesaid period of two months.

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.

May 21, 2024

naresh.k

**(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE**

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No