



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

213

CWP-30418-2019

Date of decision: 09.07.2026

Sukhdev Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

Punjab State Power Corporation Limited & Ors.

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAMIT KUMAR

Present : Mr. Sonu Bhatia, Advocate for
Mr. Madahv Pokhrel, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Edward Augustine George, Advocate
for the respondents.

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 mandamus, directing the respondents to count the entire service of the petitioner rendered by him on work charge basis from May 1980 to 13.04.1989, daily wage basis from November, 1997 to February, 2000 and work charge basis from February, 2000 to June, 2010, followed by his regular appointment towards qualifying service for the purpose of pension and pensionary benefits and to grant him the pension and pensionary benefits under the old pension scheme (GPF Scheme) as applicable before 01.01.2004, by considering him to be in service of the respondent-corporation prior to 01.01.2004 along with interest on the arrears of pension and pensionary benefits @ 12% per annum from the date of retirement i.e. 31.01.2018. Further, a writ of certiorari has been

sought for quashing the reply of the legal notice dated 27.12.2018 (Annexure P-10), whereby the petitioner has been informed that due to non-deposit of amount towards EPF for the period of work charge with interest, the pension could not be allowed/released to him, and the respondent-corporation may kindly be directed to adjust amount of Rs.2,36,676/- towards EPF contribution for work charge service as calculated by the respondents, vide letter dated 21.03.2018 (Annexure P-11) and deduct the same from the arrears of the pension, after allowing the same to the petitioner.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that since the reliefs claimed in the present petition have been granted, therefore, the instant petition has been rendered infructuous.

3. Disposed of as having been rendered infructuous.

09.07.2026

Vinay

(NAMIT KUMAR)
JUDGE

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