

2024:PHHC:144020



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH

258

CWP-29385-2022 (O & M)  
Date of decision: 05.11.2024

Sher Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

Bhakra Beas Management Board And Ors.

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Vikas Chatrath, Advocate and  
Mr. B.P.S.Thakur, Advocate,  
for the petitioner

Mr. Anil Kumar Sharma, Advocate,  
for the respondents.

\*\*\*\*\*

**AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)**

1. Prayer made in the present petition is for direction to the respondents to count the previous work charge service of the petitioner as qualifying service for the purpose of revised pension and pensionary benefits, the resistance offered in the written statement to the said claim was pendency of LPA No.49 of 2021, titled as **Balak Ram (since deceased) thr. his LRs Vs. BBMB and others**, which stands allowed in favour of the appellants therein, vide judgment dated 18.09.2024, which the learned counsel for the petitioner states that covers his case, operative para thereof reads thus:-

“23. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances as above, all the appeals are allowed, impugned decisions dated 17.08.2016, 03.02.2020 and 08.08.2023 are set

aside. Consequently, writ petitions filed by appellants/writ petitioners are allowed to the extent that respondent Board is directed to count service of appellants rendered by them under the Government of Punjab with Bhakra Dam Project, Beas Construction Board, Beas Satluj Link Board etc. for calculating qualifying service towards pension. Arrears of pension as payable to the appellants be released to them within a period of three months from receipt of certified copy of this decision. No interest thereon is liable to be released as the matter has been adjudicated upon and decided now. However, in case, amount in question is not released within three months from receipt of certified copy of this order, appellants shall be entitled to interest at the rate of 6% per annum from the date of order till actual deposit of the amount.”

2. Learned counsel for the respondents despite his best efforts has not been able to controvert the factual position and draw out any distinctive aspects in the aforementioned judgment or cite any contrary law.
3. In view of the aforesaid, the present petition is disposed of in terms of the judgment passed in **Balak Ram** (supra).

05.11.2024

parveen kumar

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)  
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes  
Whether reportable : No