HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN AT JODHPUR

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 16428/2018

Sajjan Singh Barhat S/o Sh. Madan Singh, Aged About 72 Years, Resident Of Village Endla, Police Station- Guda Endla, Tehsil And District Pali (Raj.).

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Home Department, (Group-I) Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Director General Of Police, Police Hq, Jaipur.
3. The Inspector Of Police, Personnel, Police Hq, Jaipur.
4. Director, Pension And Pensioners Welfare Department Rajasthan, Jaipur.

----Respondents

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Abhimanyu Singh Rathore
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Shailendra Kumar Mr. Raj Singh Bhati for Mr. Ritu Raj Singh Bhati Mr. Mahaveer Pareek

---

JUSTICE DINESH MEHTA

Order

22/01/2025

1. Mr. Abhimanyu Singh Rathore, learned counsel for the petitioner, at the outset, submitted that all retiral dues have been paid to the petitioner, however due interest thereupon has not been paid to him.

2. Considering that substantial relief for which the writ petition was filed has been granted to the petitioner, the present writ petition is disposed of with a direction to the petitioner to file a representation before the respondents raising claim for interest in

terms of *Rule 89 of the Rajasthan Civil Services (Pension) Rules, 1996* or any other applicable law.

3. In case, a representation along with certified copy of the order instant is so addressed, the competent authority of the respondents shall pay the amount of interest in accordance with law, within a period of 12 weeks of receiving the same.

4. In case, the competent authority of the respondents is of the opinion that the petitioner is not entitled to the interest as claimed, they shall pass a speaking order under intimation to the petitioner against which, petitioner's right to take legal remedies shall stand reserved.

5. It is made clear that aforesaid direction to decide the representation has been issued only with a view to ensure expeditious redressal of petitioner's grievance. The same may not be construed to be an order to decide the representation in a particular manner.

6. Stay application also stands disposed of accordingly.

(DINESH MEHTA),J

101-Arun/-