



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

231

CWP-21125-2021

Date of decision: 11.03.2026

Baldev Singh Bhullar

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAMIT KUMAR

Present : Mr. K.K. Thakur, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Satnampreet Singh Chauhan, DAG, Punjab.

NAMIT KUMAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, seeking a writ of certiorari, for setting aside the order dated 07.08.2020 (Annexure P/7), passed by respondent No.2, vide which the claim of the petitioner for release of remaining amount of gratuity of Rs.3,50,000/- has been rejected. Further, a writ of mandamus has also been sought for directing the respondents to consider the claim of the petitioner and to release the remaining amount of gratuity of Rs.3,50,000/- along with interest.

2. Learned State counsel has produced a copy of order dated 20.02.2026, whereby the petitioner has been ordered to be granted the benefit of DCRG of Rs.3,50,000/- along with 6% interest i.e. Rs.1,99,903/- (total Rs.5,49,903/-). The same is taken on record. A copy of the same has been supplied to the learned counsel for the petitioner.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that although the said order has been passed, however, the amount has not been credited to the account of the petitioner.
4. Learned State counsel, on instructions from Mr. Rupinder Singh, Sr. Assistant, O/o Directorate of Small Savings, submits that the said amount of Rs.5,49,903/- shall be credited to the account of the petitioner within a period of ten days from today.
5. However, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in terms of judgment of Full Bench of this Court in *A.S. Randhawa Vs. State of Punjab : 1997(3) S.C.T. 468*, the petitioner is entitled for 12% interest.
6. The said contention has been opposed by learned State counsel by submitting that as per instructions of the Government, the admissible rate of interest has already been granted to the petitioner.
7. I have considered the submissions of both the counsel and of the view that there is no merit in the contention raised by the learned counsel for the petitioner that he should be granted 12% interest per annum as the judgment in *A.S. Randhawa's case (supra)* was passed in the year 1997 when the admissible rate of interest was on higher side.
8. Disposed of in the above terms.

11.03.2026

Vinay

(NAMIT KUMAR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No