



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

CWP No.33748 of 2024 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 13.12.2024

KULDEEP SINGH

.....Petitioner

Versus

UCO BANK ZONAL OFFICE AND ANR

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA

Present: Mr. Nikhil Sabharwal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

* * * * *

DEEPAK MANCHANDA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of direction to the respondents to release all promotional and other benefits, including arrears of salary, pension, gratuity, and provident fund, at par with Sukhdev Singh, from 30.10.1993 till 31.01.2018 in the light of the order dated 29.09.2017 passed in ***CWP-25215-2012*** titled as ***Kuldeep Singh Vs. UCO Bank and others.***

2. A perusal of the pleadings reveals that an amount of Rs.3,01,993/- was released in favour of the petitioner and this Court in writ petition i.e. CWP-25215-2012 vide order dated 29.09.2017 had issued direction to the respondents-Bank to extend promotional and other benefits to the petitioner which have been extended to Sh. Sukhdev Singh, respondent No.3 within a period of four months. Thereafter, the petitioner had filed a contempt petition i.e. COCP-3311-2019, which was disposed of vide order dated 24.07.2024 (Annexure P-18), as the respondents-Bank



complied with the judgment dated 29.07.2017 by promoting the petitioner and released the amount of Rs.3,01,993/- by way of demand draft bearing No.391730 dated 24.07.2024 issued in favour of the petitioner with the liberty to raise the grievance by way of an alternate remedy, if any but in accordance with law.

3. Through the present writ petition, the petitioner has disputed the amount received by him by virtue of earlier judgment dated 29.07.2017 and as per his own calculations the same comes to Rs.84,67,145.18/-. However, the petitioner has approached this Court without making any representation to the respondents-Bank regarding an issue which has now been raised for the first time, through this instant petition.

4. Faced with this, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner be permitted to file a fresh representation to the respondents-Bank and he would be satisfied if the present petition be disposed of by giving a direction to the respondents-Bank to decide the same within a time bound manner.

5. Notice of motion.

6. On asking of the Court, Mr. Gaurav Goel, Advocate, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents-Bank and submits that he does not object to the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner.

7. In view of the above and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the present writ petition is disposed of with a direction to the petitioner to file a fresh representation being a new cause of action. In case, any fresh representation is filed within a period of four weeks from



today, the same shall be decided within a period of four weeks thereafter by passing a detailed order, in accordance with law and if the petitioner is found entitled to any dues, the same shall also be released subsequently within further four weeks.

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

13.12.2024
sandeep

Whether Speaking/Reasoned : Yes/No

Whether Reportable : Yes/No