



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-14480-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 16.02.2026

Baldev Raj

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. Manjit Singh Uppaal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Swapan Shorey, DAG, Punjab.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (Oral)

1. The instant writ petition, as cast under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, is directed against the order dated 24.10.2024 (Annexure P-8), passed by respondent No.4, vide which, the petitioner was granted only a provisional pension, and all other consequential benefits were denied.

2. On 02.02.2026, this Court had passed the hereinafter extracted order:-

“Through the instant petition, a challenge is throw to the order dated 24.10.2024, whereby, the relief of regular pension and the gratuity, has been withheld on account of pendency of a criminal case arising out an FIR no.9, dated 22.05.2024.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has now earned acquittal in the FIR (supra), therefore, the sole cause for withholding his retiral benefits, is not in existence, and the



respondents may be directed to release all the pensionary benefits to the petitioner.

On the other hand, learned State counsel seeks an adjournment to have apposite instructions in view of the supervening events, as explained above.

In case on the next date of hearing, apposite instruction is not provided by the learned State counsel, the Chief Engineer, PWD (B&R Branch), shall cause his/her personal appearance before this Court.

Adjourned to 16.02.2026.

To be shown in the urgent list.

It is made clear that no further request for an adjournment shall be entertained on the next date of hearing, on behalf of either of the parties.”

3. Today, learned State counsel, upon having instructions from the quarter concerned, informs this Court that vide order dated 05.02.2026, benefit of regular pension, along with gratuity, has been ordered to be released in favour of the petitioner. He clarifies that the other benefits, such as leave encashment and the amount of GPF, were already granted to him, at the time of superannuation. In this view of the matter, nothing substantial survives for adjudication in the instant writ petition.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that since the amount of gratuity has been released after a huge delay, the petitioner is entitled for interest thereon.

5. In the wake of the abovesaid position, since the principal grievance of the petitioner already stands redressed, no further order is required to be passed in the matter at hand.

6. So far as the issue qua interest on the delayed payment, as referred to above, is concerned, he shall be at liberty to move the authorities



concerned, at the first instance, by way of a comprehensive representation. In the event any such representation is made, the authorities shall consider and decide the same, by passing a speaking order within six weeks therefrom, after affording due opportunity of hearing to the petitioner.

7. With the observations, as made above, the instant writ petition stands **disposed of**.

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

16.02.2026
Ak Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether reportable	Yes/No