

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

261

CWP-15326-2023
Decided on: 02.04.2024

Chander Parkash Kamboj

. . . Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

. . . Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

PRESENT: Mr.Manjit Singh Uppal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Neha Sonawane, DAG, Punjab.

VIKAS BAHL, J.(ORAL)

1. This is a Civil Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to release the retiral benefits i.e. Pension, Gratuity, Leave Encashment, GPF etc. alongwith interest @18% per annum from the date due till payment.
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 legal notice dated 25.02.2023 (Annexure P-6) and he would be satisfied at this stage, in case, the competent authority of respondent No. 1 is directed to consider the said legal notice dated 25.02.2023 (Annexure P-6) 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 competent authority of respondent No.1 would consider the said legal notice dated 25.02.2023 (Annexure P-6) 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 competent authority of respondent No. 1 to consider legal notice dated 25.02.2023 (Annexure P-6) 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 of respondent No. 1 would grant necessary relief, in accordance with law and in case, the competent authority of respondent No. 1 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. 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 the case of the petitioner independently, in accordance with law.

02.04.2024
Mehak

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?	Yes/ No
Whether reportable?	Yes /No