ww.ecourtsindia.com

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

C.W.P.No.3007 of 2006 Date of Decision:-23.09.2013

Ram Niwas Goyal

....Petitioner(s)

VS.

Punjab Tourism Development Corporation Limited and another

....Respondent(s)

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE MAHESH GROVER

Present:- Mr.Arihant Goyal, Advocate for

Mr.Ramesh Goyal, Advocate,

for the petitioner.

Mr.Anil Kshetarpal, Advocate,

for respondent No.1.

Mr. Nilesh Bhardwaj, DAG, Punjab,

for respondent No.2.

MAHESH GROVER, J.

The solitary dispute raised in this petition is that the petitioners who have been given their dues subsequent to their exercising the option for Voluntary Retirement Scheme (hereinafter known as 'VRS') introduced by the respondents upon a dis-investment being made should have carried interest on account of the delay caused in releasing the payment.

According to the petitioner, he opted for the VRS on 30.4.2003 and the amount was to be paid to him within a period of 60 days. If this period is to be construed, then the amount ought to have been paid to the

petitioner by June, 2003. But according to the respondents, the amount was paid to the petitioner in the month of September, 2003.

I am of the opinion that the period of three months, which has elapsed before the dues were paid to the petitioner, cannot be termed to be a period which is so extraordinary so as to prejudice the case of the petitioner by declining the interest. I am, thus, of the opinion that the instant petition is without any substance and, therefore, the same is dismissed.

September 23, 2013 poonam

(MAHESH GROVER) JUDGE