



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

114

CWP-23921-2024**Date of decision: 23.01.2025**

KANWAR PAL

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present: - None for the petitioner.

Ms. Tanisha Peshawaria, DAG, Haryana.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The petitioner has approached this Court for seeking directions to the respondents to release the superannuation pension alongwith the other pensionary benefits alongwith interest @ 18% on account of delayed payment.

2. It is clear from a perusal of the case file that the petitioner had retired from the post of District Social Welfare Officer, Palwal on attaining the age of superannuation on 31.03.2024. A representation dated 06.06.2024 is stated to have been submitted to the Director, Social Welfare and Empowerment Department, Haryana followed by a reminder on 14.08.2024. It is also averred that notwithstanding that there was no departmental enquiry pending against the petitioner, the benefits thereof have not been released.

3. Learned State Counsel had been directed to seek the instructions as regards the status of the admissible benefits released to the

**CWP-23921-2024**

-2-

petitioner. She on instructions from Sh. Rohit Sharma, DDA, Social Justice & Empowerment Department, Haryana has apprised that the GPF dues payable to the petitioner were released to him on 13.06.2024, the PPO, GPO and CPO benefits admissible have since then been released on 05.11.2024 while the leave encashment also stands released after being sanctioned on 18.10.2024. She submits that there are no other retirement dues which are liable to be released. It is contended that the same benefits could not be released earlier on account of certain confusion with respect to CWP-8017 of 2014. After the clarification was sought, it transpired that the petitioner had no concern with the said proceedings. The delay in release of the pensionary benefits was thus not on account of any malice but on account of certain procedural verification required to be done.

4. Taking into consideration the totality of the circumstances as also the reasons cited by the respondents, I am of the opinion that the prayer made by the petitioner has already been answered and the grievance does not survive any further. I am not inclined to extend any liberty at this juncture to direct payment of interest. The petition is accordingly disposed of as having been rendered infructuous. Liberty is, however, granted to the petitioner to seek revival of the present petition in case any other admissible due (other than interest) have still not been disbursed.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

JANUARY 23, 2025*Vishal Sharma*

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