



152

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

CWP-14355-2025

Date of Decision: 19.05.2025

SIRI PAL

..... Petitioner

Versus

UTTAR HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present : Mr. Jasbir Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Suresh Ahlawat, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Prince Singh, Advocate
for the respondents.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking direction to pay interest on delayed payment of Rs.26,674/-.

2. The petitioner during 25.06.2009 to 17.07.2010 was assigned current duty charge of SDO though he was holding substantive post of Junior Engineer (Electrical). He retired on 28.02.2022 on attaining the age of superannuation. He file Writ Petition No.21002 of 2024 before this Court seeking direction to respondent to grant him pay scale of SDO for the period he was given current duty charge of SDO. This Court vide order dated 29.08.2024 disposed of said petition with a direction to the respondent to consider petitioner's representation in accordance with law. The respondent in compliance of said order has paid a sum of Rs.26,674/-



to the petitioner. Now, he is claiming interest on the said amount.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is entitled to interest on delayed payment of arrears.

4. From the perusal of record, it is evident that petitioner was assigned current duty charge of SDO from June’ 2009 to July’ 2010. He retired on 28.02.2022. He raised claim for differential amount salary for the period from June’ 2009 to July’ 2010 in 2024 i.e. after the retirement. The said claim was hopelessly barred by limitation, nevertheless, on the directions of this Court, respondent considered his claim and released a sum of Rs.26,674/-. The petitioner now is claiming interest. It appears that he does not want to put the litigation to rest.

5. In the wake of judgment of Supreme Court in ‘**Central Council for Research in Ayurvedic Sciences and another Vs. Bikartan Das and others**’, 2023 SCC OnLine 996 and considering the period and amount involved, this Court does not find it appropriate to invoke its writ jurisdiction.

6. Dismissed.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

19.05.2025
Ali

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No