2026:HHC:13789

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH SHIMLA

CWPOA No.5509 of 2019
Reserved on: 02.04.2026
Decided on: 27.04.2026

Vakil Ram **...Petitioner**

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh and others **...Respondents**

Coram
Hon'ble Mr. Justice Jiya Lal Bhardwaj, Judge
Whether approved for reporting?[1] *Yes*

For the petitioner:	Mr. Adarsh Sharma, Advocate.
For the respondents:	Mr. Rupinder Singh Thakur, Additional Advocate General and Mr. Amit Kumar Chaudhary, Deputy Advocate General.

Jiya Lal Bhardwaj, Judge

The petitioner by way of present writ petition, has sought directions to the respondents to release his leave encashment and gratuity along with 9% interest from the due date.

---

[1] *Whether reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgment?*

2. As per the facts pleaded in the petition, the petitioner after rendering 39 years of unblemished service with the respondents in various capacities, retired as Range Officer from Lower Range Chamba, Forest Division Chamba, on 30.04.2015. Before his retirement, the petitioner vide office order dated 26.12.2014 (Annexure A-1) was granted extension in service till attainment of age of 59 years. However, the petitioner due to disease in his eyes, had applied for withdrawal of extension beyond his retirement. After retirement, the petitioner was allowed pension and other retiral benefits, except leave encashment and Death-cum-Retirement Gratuity. The petitioner was not communicated about anything adverse against him during his entire service career except a memo dated 11.12.2014 (Annexure A-4), wherein it was mentioned that 100 numbers of trees of Deodar/Fir spruce were found to have been illicitly felled in Lot No.01/13/15, Chamndrooni Dhar DPF Almi Beat.

As such, it was felt that the petitioner while working as Range Officer Upper Chamba w.e.f. 17.08.2010 to 30.04.2013 had failed to perform government duties properly and could not protect the forest from illicit felling and thus was asked to explain why disciplinary proceedings may not be initiated against him for dereliction in performance of government duties.

3. The petitioner had replied to the said memo on 28.01.2015 (Annexure A-5), stating that there was no dereliction of duties on his part as the salvage marking in respect of Lot No.01/13-15 Chandrooni Dhar DPF was done by Sh. Baldev Prasad, Deputy Ranger, the then B.O. Khundel and the said marking was carried out in the month of November 2012 and the marking list was submitted to D.F.O Office for scrutiny, enabling to submit the same to Himachal Pradesh Forest Corporation. It was also submitted that the Lot in question was existing at the height of approximately 9000

feet from sea level and such physical checking of the marking Lot was not possible till the melting of the snow that occurred in the month of May/June. The petitioner was transferred from Upper Chamba Range to Chamba Forest Division and joined as F.R Special duty Chamba Forest Division during 05/2013. During his tenure as R.O. Upper Chamba i.e. w.e.f. 17.08.2010 to 30.04.2013 none of the operation was carried out in Lot No.01/13-15.

4. The petitioner had superannuated on 30.04.2015 and was entitled to all pensionary benefits including leave encashment and gratuity, within three months, but despite lapse of 2 years, leave encashment and gratuity have not been released to him and now the respondents, to cover up their lapses, have issued a false and frivolous charge-sheet. It has been averred that since the petitioner had retired honourably and thus, withholding of leave encashment and gratuity is against the settled position of law laid down by the

Hon'ble Apex Court. The pension and retiral benefits have been declared as property as well as valuable rights of an employee and thus withholding of the same amounts to deprivation of employee from his/her valuable rights and the action on the part of the respondents is against Articles 14, 16 and 21 of the Constitution of India.

5. The respondents have filed reply to the petition and admitted that the petitioner had retired from service on 30.04.2015. The case of the petitioner was forwarded to the Senior Deputy Accountant General on 08.10.2015 for approval/authorization of the payment of Rs.8,31,881/- as Death-cum-Retirement Gratuity and monthly pension of Rs.11,835/- and the said authority had authorized the payment of Death-cum-Retirement Gratuity and pension vide dated 17.12.2015. However, the pensionary benefits i.e. Death-cum-Retirement Gratuity and leave encashment were not released in favour of the petitioner due to the reason that

an FIR No. 82/2014 for illicit felling of trees in Almi Beat of Upper Chamba Range of Chamba Forest Division was pending before S.P. SIT Wing Chamba. The departmental proceedings against the petitioner were also instituted vide order dated 19.12.2016.

6. As per the Joint Committee Report, the illicit/unauthorized felling was substantiated during the month of 11/2014 in Lot No.1/2013-15 Chandrooni Dhar of Almi Beat and at relevant time, the petitioner was working as Range Officer of Upper Chamba Range. The total loss sustained to the Government was worked out to Rs.1,61,99,725/-. In FIR No. 82/2014 dated 07.12.2014, registered at Police Station Bharmour, the petitioner was arrested by the police under Section 379 IPC and Section 33 of the Indian Forest Act, 1927 and remained in police custody and was granted bail by the Court.

7. The amount of Death-cum-Retirement Gratuity to

the tune of Rs.8,31,881/- and leave encashment has not been released due to the pendency of FIR and departmental proceedings against the petitioner. As per the provisions contained under Central Civil Services (Pension) Rules, 1972 (for short "CCS (Pension) Rules") the retirement benefits were rightly and validly stopped till the conclusion of judicial proceedings as per Rule 68(2) of the CCS (Pension) Rules, which provides that where disciplinary proceedings against a government servant are pending on the date of retirement, no gratuity is paid until the conclusion of the proceedings and the issue of final orders thereon.

8. The petitioner filed rejoinder to the reply and controverted the facts as stated in the reply.

9. The petitioner was served with a charge-sheet to initiate departmental proceedings against him on 08.02.2017 i.e. after about two years of his retirement and further the petitioner was not named as an accused in FIR No.82/2014, as

on the date of his retirement. Further, on the date of his retirement, neither the criminal case was pending against him nor departmental enquiry was initiated, since he retired on 30.04.2015. Further, after conducting an inquiry, the Inquiry Officer has exonerated the petitioner in the month of July 2019.

10. The respondents filed the supplementary affidavit in compliance with the directions passed by this Court on 10.10.2015 and admitted the fact that though an FIR No.82/2014 dated 07.12.2014 under Sections 379, 120-B, 420, 467, 468 and 471 of the Indian Penal Code, Section 33 of the Indian Forest Act, Section 13(2) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, and Section 14 of the Specific Corrupt Practices (Prevention) Act, was registered at Police Station, Bharmour, District Chamba, in connection with the incident of illicit felling in Almi Beat. However, as per the police record, the petitioner during the course of investigation was arrayed

as an accused in the said case on 08.02.2016 and was arrested by the police on the same date. The petitioner remained in Police custody w.e.f. 08.02.2016 to 20.02.2016 and was bailed out by the learned Special Judge, Chamba, vide order dated 20.02.2016. The departmental proceedings against the petitioner were initiated vide dated 19.12.2016 and after conclusion of the inquiry, the Inquiry officer has submitted his inquiry report, and the disciplinary authority has stayed the action on the said inquiry report till the final outcome of the criminal proceedings initiated vide FIR No.82/2014, in which the Challan has been filed in the Court of learned District and Session Judge, Chamba on 09.12.2016.

11. I have heard the learned Counsel for the parties, and also perused the record carefully.

12. The undisputed facts, which emerge from the record are that the petitioner was retired from service on attaining the age of superannuation on 30.04.2015. No doubt,

an FIR No.82/2014 was lodged on 07.12.2014, but the petitioner was not named in the said FIR and his name was included only on 08.02.2016. It is also not in dispute that the charge-sheet was issued to the petitioner on 19.12.2016, which was served upon him on 08.02.2017. The memo dated 11.12.2014 was issued to the petitioner prior to his retirement, but it is settled law that the disciplinary/criminal proceedings can be said to be initiated against the employee only when a charge memo is issued to the employee in disciplinary proceedings or a charge sheet for a criminal prosecution is filed in the competent Court.

13. No doubt, as per the CCS (Pension) Rules, more particularly Rule 69(1)(c) thereof provides that no gratuity shall be paid to the Government servant until the conclusion of the departmental or judicial proceedings and issue of final orders thereon. However, in the present case neither the disciplinary proceedings were initiated against the petitioner

nor charge sheet for a criminal prosecution was filed in the competent Court and, thus, the leave encashment and gratuity amount could not have been withheld.

14. In the present case, admittedly, when the petitioner had retired on 30.04.2015, neither the disciplinary proceedings were initiated against him nor any criminal case was pending against him. It is also evident from the perusal of the inquiry report, which has been submitted by the Inquiry Officer, who has concluded that after assessment of the evidence led, Article of Charge-I has not been proved against the petitioner beyond reasonable doubt, inasmuch as from the statements of the witnesses, no felling was done by the H.P. State Forest Development Corporation during the tenure of the petitioner as Range Officer, Upper Chamba, and till his transfer to lower Chamba Range on 30.04.2013, hence, the Article of Charge-II is also not proved against him.

15. It is now well settled that pension is not a bounty,

but is succour for post-retirement period. No doubt, as per Rule 69(1)(c) of CCS (Pension) Rules, no gratuity shall be paid to the government servant until the conclusion of the departmental or judicial proceedings or the issuance of the final order thereupon, but it is crystal clear from the reply filed by the respondents that on the date of retirement i.e. 30.04.2015, there was neither a departmental enquiry nor any criminal case pending against the petitioner, though an FIR No.82/2014 dated 07.12.2014 was registered, but the name of the petitioner was not in the said FIR and his name was arrayed only on 08.02.2016. Once the name of the petitioner was not in the FIR, which was though prior in time from the date of his superannuation, the question which requires determination is whether the respondents can withhold the amount of DCRG and leave encashment.

16. Chapter VIII of the CCS (Pension) Rules, deals with determination and authorization of the amounts of pension

and gratuity. Rules 56 to 74 are comprised in this chapter. These rules, *inter alia*, contemplate the following steps to be taken in the sequence of time: (1) the preparation of a list every six months, i.e, on the 1st January and the 1st July of each year, of all the Government servants, who are due to retire within the next 24 to 30 months of that date and the supply of a copy of every such list to the Accounts Officer concerned not later than the 31st January or the 31st July, as the case may be, of that year; (2) the preparation of pension papers to commence two years before the date on which a government servant is due to retire on superannuation, or on the date on which he proceeds on leave preparatory to retirement whichever is earlier; such preparatory work to consist of three consecutive stages, namely, verification of service record, making good of omissions in the service book and obtaining of requisite particulars from the retiring government servant; the last of the above mentioned stages

to be completed eight months prior to the date of retirement; (3) the completion of the pension and gratuity papers and the forwarding thereof to the Accounts Officer concerned not later than six months before the date of retirement; (4) the ascertainment and assessment of the government dues and furnishing of particulars thereof to the Accounts Officer at least two months before the date of retirement; (5) the assessment of the amount of pension and gratuity and the issue of the pension payment order by the Accounts Officer not later than one month in advance of the date of retirement, and (6) the determination by the Head of Office of provisional pension and death-cum-retirement gratuity without delay, in cases where the government servant is likely to retire before his pension and gratuity or both can be finally assessed and settled in accordance with law; the payment of such provisional pension and gratuity not to continue beyond the period of six months from the date of retirement by

which time the final amount of pension must be determined.

17. The aforesaid time-bound stages in the process of determination of pensionary benefits, laid down in the rules, ensure the payment of benefits to the retiring Government servant. These rules confer rights, prescribe duties and constitute the conditions of service of Government servants.

18. In the present case, as already discussed above, on the date of retirement of the petitioner, neither he was served with the charge-sheet nor he was involved in the criminal case, though an FIR was lodged, but simply by arraying the petitioner later on, cannot be a ground to deny him the pensionary benefits, which is a right accrued to him to receive the benefits in lieu of the service rendered by him with the respondents.

19. This very issue has been succinctly dealt with by the Division Bench of this Court in **CWP No.1121 of 2021**, titled, ***Satnam versus State of Himachal Pradesh and others***,

and after considering the entire gamut of the matter, the Court held as under:-

> *"6. It would clearly be evident from the reply filed by the respondents that as on the date of retirement i.e. 31.10.2017, there was neither a departmental inquiry nor any criminal case pending against the petitioner. Even the FIR No. 0001/2018 that was registered was after the retirement of the petitioner on 25.02.2018 wherein again the petitioner has not even been arraigned as an accused.*
>
> *7. Now, in such circumstances, the moot question arises as to whether the respondents could have at all withheld the retiral benefits.*
>
> *8. Chapter VIII of the Central Civil Services (Pension) Rules, 1972 (hereinafter referred to as "the Rules") deals with the determination and authorisation of the amounts of pension and gratuity. Rules 56 to 74 are comprised in this chapter. Briefly speaking, the rules, inter alia, contemplate the following steps to be taken in the sequence of time: (1) the preparation of a list every six months, that is, on the 1st January and the 1st July of each year, of all government servants who are due to retire within the next 24 to 30 months of that date and the supply of a copy of every such list to the Accounts Officer concerned not later than the 31st January or the 31st July, as the case may be, of that year, (2) the preparation of pension papers to commence two years before the date on which a government servant is due to retire on superannuation, or on the date on which he proceeds on leave preparatory to retirement whichever is earlier; such preparatory work to consist of three consecutive stages, namely, verification of service*

record, making good of omissions in the service book and obtaining of requisite particulars from the retiring government servant; the last of the above mentioned stages to be completed eight months prior to the date of retirement, (3) the completion of the pension and gratuity papers and the forwarding thereof to the Accounts Officer concerned not later than six months before the date of retirement; (4) the ascertainment and assessment of the government dues and furnishing of particulars thereof to the Accounts Officer at least two months before the date of retirement; (5) the assessment of the amount of pension and gratuity and the issue of the pension payment order by the Accounts Officer not later than one month in advance of the date of retirement, and (6) the determination by the Head of Office of provisional pension and death-cum-retirement gratuity without delay, in cases where the government servant is likely to retire before his pension and gratuity or both can be finally assessed and settled in accordance with law; the payment of such provisional pension and gratuity not to continue beyond the period of six months from the date of retirement by which time the final amount of pension must be determined.

9. These various time bound stages in the process of determination of pensionary benefits as laid down in the Rules reflect the policy of the State to ensure the payment of such benefits to a retiring government servant on and from the date of his retirement. These Rules, which confer rights and prescribe duties, constitute the conditions of service of government servants. They fall within the realm of public law governing the relationship between the employer and employees in the field of public employment. The

implementation and enforcement of those statutory conditions is the duty of every Head of Department/Accounts Officer and, indeed, of all those concerned at different stages and levels of the process of determination of the pensionary benefits. They must not forget that by the passage of time they too would be claiming those benefits and that any infringement of those conditions on their part may conceivably recoil on them in course of time.

10. As observed above, the petitioner on the date of his retirement did not have a criminal case or any departmental inquiry contemplated or pending against him. Therefore, in the given circumstances, there was no reasonable basis or ground available with the respondents for withholding the retiral benefits of the petitioner and the same is, therefore, contrary to law.

11. It is more than settled that once an employee retires from service on attaining the age of superannuation, there is no authority vested with the employer (like the respondents in the instant case) for initiating disciplinary proceedings even for the purpose of reduction in the retiral benefits payable to the employee. This has so been held by this Court in CWPOA No. 138 of 2019 titled ***Lokinder Dutt Sharma vs. Board of Directors H.P. Horticulture Produce Marketing and Processing Corporation Ltd. And another****, decided on 18.03.2020.*

12. The pension and gratuity, as stated above, are not mere bounties, or given out of generosity of employer, but these are benefits earned by the employee by virtue of his long, continuous faithful service.

13. This aspect of the matter has recently been considered in detail by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in

Hira Lal vs. State of Bihar and others (2020) 4 SCC 346*, wherein it was observed as under:*

> *"22. It is well settled that the right to pension cannot be taken away by a mere executive fiat or administrative instruction. Pension and gratuity are not mere bounties, or given out of generosity by the employer. An employee earns these benefits by virtue of his long, continuous, faithful and unblemished service. The right to receive pension of a public servant has been held to be covered under the "right to property" under Article 31(1) of the Constitution by a Constitution bench of this Court in Deokinandan Prasad v. State of Bihar, ((1971) 2 SCC 330, which ruled that: (Deokinandan Prasad case, SCC pp. 34344, paras 30-31 & 33)*
>
> > *"30. The question whether the pension granted to a public servant is property attracting Article 31(1) came up for consideration before the Punjab High Court in Bhagwant Singh v. Union of India [AIR 1962 Punj 503] . It was held that such a right constitutes "property" and any interference will be a breach of Article 31(1) of the Constitution. It was further held that the State cannot by an executive order curtail or abolish altogether the right of the public servant to receive pension. This decision was given by a learned Single Judge. This decision was taken up in letters patent appeal by the Union of India. Letters Patent Bench in its decision in Union of India v. Bhagwant Singh [ILR 1965 Punj 1] approved the decision of the learned Single Judge. The*

Letters Patent Bench held that the pension granted to a public servant on his retirement is "property" within the meaning of Article 31(1) of the Constitution and he could be deprived of the same only by an authority of law and that pension does not cease to be property on the mere denial or cancellation of it. It was further held that the character of pension as "property" cannot possibly undergo such mutation at the whim of a particular person or authority.

31. The matter again came up before a Full Bench of the Punjab and Haryana High Court in K.R. Erry v. State of Punjab [ILR 1967 Punj & Har 278] . The High Court had to consider the nature of the right of an officer to get pension. The majority quoted with approval the principles laid down in the two earlier decisions of the same High Court, referred to above, and held that the pension is not to be treated as a bounty payable on the sweet will and pleasure of the Government and that the right to superannuation pension including its amount is a valuable right vesting in a government servant. It was further held by the majority that even though an opportunity had already been afforded to the officer on an earlier occasion for showing cause against the imposition of penalty for lapse or misconduct on his part and he has been found guilty, nevertheless, when a cut is sought to be imposed in the quantum of pension payable to an officer

on the basis of misconduct already proved against him, a further opportunity to showcause in that regard must be given to the officer. This view regarding the giving of further opportunity was expressed by the learned Judges on the basis of the relevant Punjab Civil Service Rules. But the learned Chief Justice in his dissenting judgment was not prepared to agree with the majority that under such circumstances a further opportunity should be given to an officer when a reduction in the amount of pension payable is made by the State. It is not necessary for us in the case on hand to consider the question whether before taking action by way of reducing or denying the pension on the basis of disciplinary action already taken, a further notice to showcause should be given to an officer. That question does not arise for consideration before us. Nor are we concerned with the further question regarding the procedure, if any, to be adopted by the authorities before reducing or withholding the pension for the first time after the retirement of an officer. Hence we express no opinion regarding the views expressed by the majority and the minority Judges in the above Punjab High Court decision on this aspect. But we agree with the view of the majority when it has approved its earlier decision that pension is not a bounty payable on the sweet will and pleasure of the Government

and that, on the other hand, the right to pension is a valuable right vesting in a government servant.

** ** **

33. Having due regard to the above decisions, we are of the opinion that the right of the petitioner to receive pension is property under Article 31(1) and by a mere executive order the State had no power to withhold the same. Similarly, the said claim is also property under Article 19(1)(f) and it is not saved by sub article (5) of Article 19. Therefore, it follows that the order, dated June 12, 1968, denying the petitioner right to receive pension affects the fundamental right of the petitioner under Articles 19(1)(f) and 31(1) of the Constitution, and as such the writ petition under Article 32 is maintainable..." [emphasis supplied]

23. The aforesaid judgment was followed in D.S. Nakara and Ors. v. Union of India, (1983) 1 SCC 305, by another Constitution bench of this Court, which held that: (SCC pp. 320 & 323-24, paras 20. 29 and 31)

"20. The antiquated notion of pension being a bounty, a gratuitous payment depending upon the sweet will or grace of the employer not claimable as a right and, therefore, no right to pension can be enforced through Court has been swept under the carpet by the decision of the Constitution Bench in Deoki Nandan Prasad v. State of Bihar and Ors.: wherein this Court authoritatively ruled that

pension is a right and the payment of it does not depend upon the discretion of the Government but is governed by the rules and a Government servant coming within those rules is entitled to claim pension. It was further held that the grant of pension does not depend upon any one's discretion. It is only for the purpose of quantifying the amount having regard to service and other allied maters that it may be necessary for the authority to pass an order to that effect but the right to receive pension flows to the officer not because of any such order but by virtue of the rules. This view was reaffirmed in State of Punjab and Anr. v. Iqbal Singh. (1976) 2 SCC 1.

*** *** ***

29. Summing up it can be said with confidence that pension is not only compensation for loyal service rendered in the past, but pension also has a broader significance, in that it is a measure of socioeconomic justice which inheres economic security in the fall of life when physical and mental prowess is ebbing corresponding to aging process and, therefore, one is required to fall back on savings. One such saving in kind is when you give your best in the heyday of life to your employer, in days of invalidity, economic security by way of periodical payment is assured. The term has been judicially defined as a stated allowance or stipend made in consideration of past

service or a surrender of rights or emoluments to one retired from service. Thus the pension payable to a government employee is earned by rendering long and efficient service and therefore can be said to be a deferred portion of the compensation or for service rendered. In one sentence one can say that the most practical raison d'etre for pension is the inability to provide for oneself due to old age. One may live and avoid unemployment but not senility and penury if there is nothing to fall back upon.

*** **** ***

31. From the discussion three things emerge: (i) that pension is neither a bounty nor a matter of grace depending upon the sweet will of the employer and that it creates a vested right subject to 1972 Rules which are statutory in character because they are enacted in exercise of powers conferred by the proviso to Article 309 and clause (5) of Article 148 of the Constitution; (ii) that the pension is not an ex gratia payment but it is a payment for the past service rendered; and (iii) it is a social welfare measure rendering socioeconomic justice to those who in the heyday of their life ceaselessly toiled for the employer on an assurance that in their old age they would not be left in lurch..” [emphasis supplied]

24. The right to receive pension has been held to be a right to property protected under Article

> *300A of the Constitution even after the repeal of Article 31(1) by the Constitution (Forty Fourth Amendment) Act, 1978 w.e.f. 20.06.1979, as held in State of West Bengal v. Haresh C. Banerjee and Ors. (2006) 7 SCC 651).”*
>
> *14. In view of the aforesaid exposition of law, the action of the respondents in not paying the entire retiral dues to the petitioner is not only unjustified, but is clearly illegal.”*

20. The facts of the present case are similar to the one which were in the aforementioned judgment passed by this Court, and thus there is no plausible reason with the respondents to withhold the pensionary benefits to the petitioner. In the present case, the petitioner had retired from service on attaining the age of superannuation on 30.04.2015 and till date the criminal proceedings have not been culminated. Once the petitioner was exonerated in the inquiry conducted by the respondents, the respondents cannot now withhold his retiral benefits merely on the ground that the criminal proceedings are pending against him.

21. No doubt, mere exoneration of the petitioner in

departmental proceedings does not entitle him to pensionary benefits, if criminal proceedings are pending, but in the present case, as discussed above, on the date when the petitioner had retired from service, neither the disciplinary proceedings were pending nor criminal case was lodged against him, though an FIR No.82/2014 was lodged on 07.12.2014, in which the name of the petitioner was arrayed later on.

22. It is settled law that the disciplinary proceedings commence from the date of issuance of the charge-sheet to an employee and in the present case, the respondents have not disputed that the petitioner was served with the charge-sheet only on 19.12.2016, which is much after his retirement on 30.04.2015 and further, his name was arrayed in the case on 08.02.2016. Thus, the respondents for indefinite period, cannot withhold the retiral benefits of the petitioner, to which he is legally entitled under law.

23. The Hon’ble Supreme Court has held in plethora of judgments that the right to pension cannot be taken away by mere executive fiat or administrative instructions. The pension and gratuity are not mere bounty or given out of generosity by the employer to an employee. An employee earns these benefits by virtue of his long, continuous, faithful and unblemished service and the right to receive pension of a public servant has been held to be covered under the Right to Property under Article 31(1) of the Constitution of India. Therefore, to impart justice to the petitioner, he is also entitled to interest on the pensionary benefits after expiry of three months from the date of retirement of the petitioner.

24. Ordinarily, three months are taken to defray the retiral benefits to an employee, however, in the present case, the DCRG and leave encashment have not been paid to the petitioner only on account of pendency of the criminal case against him, though he has now been exonerated in the

inquiry, though the disciplinary authority has neither issued any show cause notice to the petitioner as required under law nor it has disagreed with the said inquiry report. Thus, there is no justification to withhold the retiral benefits.

25. Consequently, the present petition is allowed and the respondents are directed to release Death-cum-Retirement Gratuity amounting to Rs.8,31,881/- and also the amount of leave encashment to the petitioner along with interest @6% per annum from 01.08.2015 till the date of its payment. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

27th April, 2026
(ankit)

(Jiya Lal Bhardwaj)
Judge