

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

KRISHAN KUMAR KACHORIAApplicant
VERSUS
STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERSRespondent(s)

On being asked to point out any pleadings in the petition to say that the applicant/petitioner was not called to fill the form or on what date, the applicant/petitioner was asked to fill the form, the learned counsel for the review-applicant concedes that no such detail have been given in the petition.

Once, there is no such detail that the State failed to comply with the Rule 71, the assertion of the petitioner that the delay in releasing the pension was due to act of the respondent-State cannot be accepted.

Further, in the reply as well as in the impugned order, it has been mentioned that the pension papers were submitted by the applicant/petitioner on the date of retirement, which clearly shows that a requirement of signing the pension papers is to be completed by the applicant/petitioner. Nothing has come on record to show that the pension papers were also given to the applicant/petitioner on the date of retirement. Rather, the respondents in their reply, have pleaded qua the applicant/petitioner, who submitted the pension papers after completing the same on the date of his retirement. Hence, the ground raised to seek the review of the order is not born out of the pleadings between the parties so as to be a proper ground to review the impugned order dated 01.02.2024. Further, no such ground was taken at the time when the petition was heard as the order was dictated in the presence of the counsels for the parties in the open Court.

No ground is made out for the review of the order dated 01.02.2024.

The present review application is dismissed.

Pending application, if any, also stands disposed of.

13-09-2024
Sapna Goyal

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

NOTE: Whether speaking: YES/NO
Whether reportable: YES/NO