

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPS No. 3469 of 2014

1. R.B. Shivilahare S/o Shri Ram Khilawan Shivilahare Aged About 50 years Presently Working On The Post Of Sub Engineer Water Resources Department Sub Division Premnagar Division Surajpur Distt. Surajpur C.G.

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of Water Resource Department, Mahanadi Bhawan , New Raipur C.G.
2. Executive Engineer, Water Resources Department Division Surajpur Distt. Surajpur C.G.
3. Sub Divisional Officer Water Resource Department Sub Division Premnagar Distt. Surajpur C.G.

---- Respondent

And

WPS No. 377 Of 2015

1. Shriram Dahariya S/o Shri B.P. Dahariya Aged About 56 years R/o Qtr. N O. G-48, New Bairaj Colony, P.S. Civil Lines Rudri Dhamtari, District Dhamtari C.G.

---- Petitioner

Vs

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary Water Resources Department, Mahanadi Bhawan Naya Raipur Distt. Raipur C.G.
2. The Secretary Department Of Water Resources Mantralaya Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur C.G.
3. Sub Divisional Officer, Water Management Sub Division No. 8, Gurur, District Balod C.G.

---- Respondent

And

WPS No. 3965 Of 2014

1. Shriram Dahariya S/o Shri B.P.Dahariya Aged About 56 years R/o Qtr. No. G-48, New Bairaj Colony, Ps Civil Line, Rudri, Dhamtari, Distt Dhamtari, Cg

---- Petitioner

Vs

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Department Of Water Resources, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, Dist Raipur, Cg
2. Secretary, Department Of Water Resources, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, Dist Raipur, Cg
3. Sub Divisional Officer, Water Management Sub Division No. 8, Gurur, Dist Balod, Cg

---- Respondent

For respective Petitioners	Shri N.N. Roy & Shri A.N. Pandey, Advocates
For Respondent/State	Shri J.K. Gilda, Adv. General with Shri P.K. Bhaduri, Govt. Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Prashant Kumar Mishra

Order On Board

28/07/2015

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

1. At the very outset, learned Advocate General appearing for the State would submit that the orders under challenge in these petitions have already been cancelled by the State, and, as such, the writ petitions have been rendered infructuous, to which learned counsel appearing for the respective petitioners have no objection.
2. Accordingly, all the writ petitions are dismissed as having become infructuous.

Sd/-

Judge

Prashant Kumar Mishra

Gowri