

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CM Nos.12449-450 of 2015 in/and
CWP No.1970 of 2015 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 06.10.2015

Vikram Singh Nehra

... Petitioner

Versus

Chandigarh Administration and others

... Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV NARAIN RAINA

Present: Mr. Dinesh Arora, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sourabh Goel, Advocate,
for the applicant.

1. To be referred to the Reporters or not?
2. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

RAJIV NARAIN RAINA, J.

CM No.12450 of 2015

For the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is
allowed and the case is taken up today itself.

Main Case

On September 22, 2015 I passed the following order:-

*“This petition was based on the sole plea of Jat reservation in appointments to public post. The notification dated 04.03.2014 creating such reservation has been struck down by the Supreme Court as ultra vires the Constitution in **Ram Singh and others vs. Union of India**, 2015 (2) RSJ 236. It may be noted that before the law was declared by the Supreme Court the petitioner had relied on Jat reservation in Haryana via the Central Government for*

quota reservation in UT Administration. Since the foundation of the argument stands subsumed in the judgment of the Supreme Court the right to such reservation stands extinguished, whether in Haryana, or in UT Chandigarh.

The applicant has filed the present application under Order 1 Rule 10 CPC for impleading him as being affected by the pendency of this writ petition and not being offered appointment by the UT Administration on the post of Assistant District Attorney and in case, the currency of the waiting list expires, which it will in one year then the applicant would be prejudiced and disadvantaged for no fault of his and only on account of the fact that this petition is pending and in which there is an interim order dated 06.02.2015 that the petitioner's candidature shall be considered by the respondent by treating his application as validly made and this shall be subject to the final outcome of the writ petition. None appeared on behalf of the petitioner on 04.08.2015 and it is evident that the petitioner has lost both hope and interest in the petition. However, its pendency should not disturb the rights of persons likely to be affected by the sheer pendency of this infructuous petition.

*Notice of the applications to the opposite counsel
Mr. Dinesh Arora, Advocate for 06.10.2015.*

To be shown in the urgent list.”

Mr. Arora appearing for the petitioner is unable to tide over the issue that he is confronted with in this case.

Dismissed in view of the decision of the Supreme Court in **Ram Singh and others vs. Union of India**, 2015 (2) RSJ 236.

**(RAJIV NARAIN RAINA)
JUDGE**

06.10.2015
manju