

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

COCP No. 672 of 2014

Date of Decision: March 24, 2015

Gurkirat Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

Prof. A.K. Bhandari

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH

Present: Mr. A.S. Talwar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Subhash Ahuja, Advocate
for the respondent.

AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH, J. (Oral):

Counsel for the petitioner has placed reliance upon the concluding part of the order dated 07.11.2013 where while dismissing the writ petition of the petitioners, it was observed that Rule 4 (ii) would be applicable to all the students for the batch of 2011-12. He contends that the said benefit was not, however, conferred upon the petitioner.

This contention of counsel for the petitioner cannot be accepted in the light of the fact as it has been clearly distinguished in the judgment passed that his claim is different from that of Gurkirat Singh who was not their batch-mate and belonged to the batch of 2010-11 whereas the petitioner was for the batch of 2011-12. This is exactly what has been pointed out by the respondent in his reply. In any case, much water has flown and therefore, no benefit can be conferred upon the petitioner.

The contempt petition, therefore, stands dismissed.

Rule discharged.

**(AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH)
JUDGE**

March 24, 2015

Harish