



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

(127) CWP-20711-2024
Date of Decision : 27.08.2024

Raj Kumar Garg and others .. Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others .. Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Ms. Riti Aggarwal, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Charanpreet Singh, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

Harsimran Singh Sethi, J. (Oral)

1. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the only grievance of the petitioners is that the arrears for the revised pension w.e.f. 01.01.2016 till 30.06.2021 is not being decided by the respondents despite expiry of adequate time period even after the passing of the order dated 29.10.2021 (Annexure P-4).
2. Learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that the other grievance of the petitioners is that the DA to which they are entitled is neither being paid nor decided by the respondents, which is also causing prejudice to the petitioners.
3. Notice of motion.
4. Mr. Charanpreet Singh, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab, who is present in the Court, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.
5. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that while passing order in **CWP-29782 of 2022 titled as Satya Parkash Khanna and others**



vs. State of Punjab and others, decided on 11.07.2024, State has already undertaken to decide the issue of the release of the arrears to the retirees, who were employees of the aided institutions, and six months time has been granted and within the said period, even the claim of the petitioners for the grant of arrears will be decided by passing an appropriate speaking order.

6. Learned counsel for the respondents further submits that even with regard to the claim of the petitioners for the grant of DA as being claimed will be decided and in case, the petitioners are found entitled for any amount, the same will also be released to the petitioners otherwise due reasons will be mentioned in the speaking order for not accepting the claim of the petitioners for their information and necessary action.

7. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that keeping in view the statement of learned State counsel, the present writ petition may kindly be disposed of having been not pressed any further, at this stage.

8. Ordered accordingly.

9. It may be noticed that the petitioners are senior citizen and petitioner Nos. 9 and 10 are 76 years old. In case the undertaking so recorded here-in-before is not complied with, serious view will be taken including initiation of suo moto contempt proceedings against the respondents concerned.

August 27, 2024

kanchan

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : No