

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

C.W.P. No.12978 of 2015

Date of Decision : 03.07.2015

Mahavir Mittal

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present : Mr. K.S. Malik-I, Advocate
for the petitioner.

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?

AJAY TEWARI, J. (Oral)

The petitioner is working as a clerk in the establishment of the District and Sessions Judge, Rohtak and on 09.06.2012 he sustained an injury and became blind in the left eye. By this writ petition he is seeking the following reliefs:-

- i) Rs.8 lakh as compensation from the State for the injury he has suffered.
- ii) A direction to respondent No.3-District and Session Judge, Rohtak to assign him light duty.
- iii) Interest on the amount of compensation claimed.

As regards the claim for compensation, the petitioner himself

avers in para No.3 of the petition that the injury suffered by him was as a

result of an accident. If that is so and there is no allegation of any negligence on the part of the respondents the claim for compensation is clearly and manifestly not maintainable.

As regards the prayer for light duty, I asked the learned counsel what duties the petitioner is doing these days. He informs the Court that these days the petitioner is working as a clerk but wants that he should be given some light duty in the record room or in the judges library. I fail to understand that what is the difference between doing duty in the record room or the judges library because even then the petitioner has to do the duty of reading with one eye. The petition is entirely misconceived and by his own showing the petitioner had made several representations and even served a legal notice, all each of which had been responded yet he has chosen to go ahead with this writ petition in a most unbecoming and stubborn manner.

Consequently, this petition is dismissed with costs of Rs.20,000/- to be deposited with the State Legal Services Authority, U.T., Chandigarh.

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

July 03, 2015
ashish

(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE