

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

**1. C.W.P. No.2736 of 2003 (O&M)
Date of Decision : 11.03.2015**

Bharat Singh Beniwal & others

..... Petitioners

versus

The State of Haryana & others

..... Respondents

**2. C.W.P. No.2981 of 2003 (O&M)
Date of Decision : 11.03.2015**

Mr.P.S.Patyal & others

..... Petitioners

versus

Chief Secretary to the Govt. of Haryana & others

..... Respondents

**3. C.W.P. No.3088 of 2003 (O&M)
Date of Decision : 11.03.2015**

Prem Nath & others

..... Petitioners

versus

The State of Haryana & others

..... Respondents

**4. C.W.P. No.3728 of 2003 (O&M)
Date of Decision : 11.03.2015**

Shri Kasturi Lal Khanna

..... Petitioner

versus

Chief Secretary to the Govt. of Haryana & others

..... Respondents

5.

**C.W.P. No.4495 of 2003 (O&M)
Date of Decision : 11.03.2015**

Bhagwati Parsad

..... Petitioner

versus

The Chief Secretary to the Govt. of Haryana & others

..... Respondents

6.

**C.W.P. No.6740 of 2003 (O&M)
Date of Decision : 11.03.2015**

Dr.N.K.Rana & others

..... Petitioners

versus

State of Haryana & others

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present : None for the petitioners.

Mr.Ashok Kumar Chaudhary, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

Mr.Akshit Chaudhary, Advocate for
Mr.N.D.Kalra, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

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

AJAY TEWARI, J. (Oral)

All these petitions are connected and are being disposed of by common order since cause of action in all the cases are related.

By these petitions the petitioners have challenged the order whereby the respondent-Haryana State Minor Irrigation & Tubewells

Corporation Limited (for short '**Corporation**') was ordered to be closed down and have prayed that in the alternative a mandamus be issued directing respondent-State of Haryana to adjust/absorb the petitioners.

In this connection, the learned Additional Advocate General has pointed out that in the first place the Corporation has since been closed down and secondly no person has a right to claim absorption and thirdly by policy dated 21/06/2006 the Government has reserved all future posts of Group 'C' and 'D' for retrenched employees like the petitioners and beyond this no further relief can be granted to the petitioners since by now all persons who were eligible have been granted either the benefit of retrenchment compensation or have been absorbed in other departments.

In these circumstances these writ petitions are disposed of as having been rendered infructuous. However, since none has appeared on behalf of the petitioners they are at liberty to move an application for revival if any cause of action survives.

Since the main case has been decided, the pending civil miscellaneous application, if any, also stands disposed of.

March 11, 2015

Pooja Sharma-I

**(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE**