



107

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-10961-2025

Date of decision: 11.08.2025

Murti Devi

....Petitioner

Versus

Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Ltd. and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR**Present:** Mr. J.K. Goel, Advocate
for the petitioner.Ms. Rajni Gupta, Advocate
for the respondents-UHBVNL.**HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)**

The present civil writ petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of *certiorari* for quashing of impugned letter memo No. CH-11/Disposal/EMD-27 dated 22.04.2024 issued by respondent No.5 attached as (Annexure P-6) and further for issuance of a writ in the nature of *mandamus* directing the authorities to count the daily wage service rendered by the husband of the petitioner w.e.f. 01.01.1981 to 03.02.1986 and further to grant interest on the amount of Rs.1,26,474/- w.e.f. 31.04.2014.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, despite the fact that the case of the petitioner is squarely covered by the ratio of law as laid down by the Full Bench of this Court in '**Kesar Chand v. State of Punjab**', AIR 1998 (Punjab) 265, the impugned order (Annexure P-6), which has been passed in compliance with the directions issued by this Court, fails to consider the benefit of the past service rendered by the husband of the petitioner during the period from 1981 to 1986, in terms of the said judgment.

Learned counsel for the respondents, at the very outset, submits that the benefit for the services rendered by the husband of the petitioner during the period from 01.01.1986 to 10.05.1993 has already been granted. However, it is further submitted that the name of the husband of the petitioner does not



CWP-10961-2025

-2-

appear in the attendance roll for the said work-charged period from 01.01.1981 to 03.02.1986. Learned counsel further submits that the claim of the petitioner shall be re-examined and speaking order shall be passed within a period of four months.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record of the case.

Keeping in view the above discussion, the present civil writ petition is disposed of and the respondents are directed to consider the claim of the petitioner and pass a reasoned and speaking order satisfying the objective standards of reason and justice, after affording her an opportunity to be heard, within a period of 04 months from the date of receiving a certified copy of this order. Further, the decision taken thereof shall be conveyed to the petitioner.

Needless to say, if the petitioner is found entitled to any interest on account of delay in releasing the retiral dues, he would be entitled to interest of 6% per annum in terms of the judgment rendered by a Full Bench of this Court in *A.J. Randhawa Supg. Engineer (Retd.) vs. State of Punjab 1998 (1) SCT 343*.

Disposed of accordingly.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

11.08.2025

Neha

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No