

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA, CHANDIGARH

ARCHANA ARORA
Digitized by eGangotri
11:50
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document

CWP No. 6523 of 1999
Date of decision : July 29, 2015

Smt. Raj Rani and another

..... Petitioners

Versus

The State of Haryana and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present:- None for the petitioners.

Mr. I. D. Singla, Advocate
for respondent No.6.

Mr. Ashish Gupta, Advocate
for respondent No.7.

Dr. Sushil Gautam, DAG., Haryana.

1. Whether reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest?

Amit Rawal, J (oral).

On going through the writ petition it is found that the petitioners have challenged the reversion order dated 5.5.1999 (Annexure P-11) and the same was stayed by this Court on 17.5.1999. The order reads thus:-

"It is, inter alia, contended by the learned counsel for the petitioners that not only in the orders of transfer of the petitioners, copies annexures P-2 and P-3 whereby petitioners were transferred from Kurukshetra to Karnal, it was never mentioned that they (petitioners) would lose their service for purpose of seniority in Kurukshetra District, even in

the seniority lists, which were issued after the transfer of the petitioners in Karnal District in the years 1981, 1985 and 1988, they (petitioners) were given the benefit of their services in Kurukshetra District. The respondents, to the knowledge of the petitioner did not challenge those seniority lists, whereby the petitioners have been given the benefit of the past service in Kurukshetra District.

Notice of motion for June 2, 1999. Mr. I. D. Singla, Advocate accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.6. Copy of the writ petition has been handed over to him, on our asking, Mr. Harish Rathee, DAG., Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of respondent Nos. 1 to 4. Two copies of the writ petition have been handed over to him.

Notice be given dasti for respondents No.5,7 and 8.

Reversion of the petitioners is stayed.”

Learned counsel for the respondents had submitted that the petitioners as well as private respondents have superannuated and the petitioners had worked on the post they were working and had drawn salary, therefore, no cause of action survives in the present writ petition. There is also no representation on behalf of the petitioners, probably for the reason that the cause of action accrued in the year 1999 no longer survives.

Accordingly, the writ petition has become infructuous and the same is disposed of as such.

**(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE**

**July 29 , 2015
archana**