

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

CWP No.16125 of 2013
Date of decision: 08.05.2015

Sukhdarshan Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI

Present: Mr. SC Pathela, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Pankaj Mulwani, DAG, Punjab.

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?

ARUN PALLI J. (Oral)

The precise stand set out in paragraph 3 of the affidavit filed by Superintendent of Police (HQ) Faridkot, on behalf of respondents No.1 to 5, reveals that in compliance to the instructions received from the State Government, petitioner had been given revised seniority in list D-1 w.e.f. 01.04.2008 and date of promotion to the rank of ASI w.e.f. 07.01.2010 at par with ASI Leela Ram, vide order dated 01.11.2014, passed by Deputy Inspector General of Police, Ferozepur Range, Ferozepur Cantt (Annexure R-1/T). The revised service particulars of the petitioner are tabulated in Annexure R-1/T, appended with the affidavit. That being so, learned State counsel submits that nothing substantive survives in this petition.

Learned counsel for the petitioner fairly concedes this position. However, he submits that although he has been granted promotion to the rank of ASI w.e.f. 07.01.2010 i.e. the date from which the persons junior to the petitioner were promoted but the petitioner has not been granted the arrears from the said date.

That being so, learned State counsel submits that in case the petitioner would move the authorities in this regard by any representation, the same shall be considered in accordance with law.

As a result, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the matter in hand has indeed become infructuous and be disposed of as such.

Disposed of as having become infructuous.

May 8 2015
Rajan

(Arun Palli)
Judge