



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

CWP-1537-2018

Date of Decision: 18.11.2025

Ramesh Chander

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and Others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. Jugam Arora, Advocate
 for the petitioner.

Mr. Aman Dhir, DAG, Punjab.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The dispute in the instant petition is confined to entitlement of petitioner to subsistence allowance for the period from 07.11.2017 to 08.04.2019.

2. The petitioner is claiming that he is entitled to at least 50% salary for the said period. As per reply, as well as during the course of arguments, learned State counsel submitted that petitioner did not mark his presence during aforesaid suspension period, thus, he is not entitled to subsistence allowance. Inquiry with respect to said period is still pending. On the conclusion of inquiry, fate of aforesaid period would be determined.

3. On being asked, learned counsel representing the petitioner submits that his grievance, at this stage, would be redressed if respondents are directed to conclude pending inquiry within three months from today and determine status of subsistence allowance for the said

period.

4. Learned State counsel submits that Competent Authority would do the needful within three months from today.

5. In the wake of statement of both sides, the present petition stands disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

18.11.2025
Prince Chawla

Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No