

Civil Writ Petition No. 19809 of 2015 (O&M)

Date of decision : October 09, 2015

Saradhu Ram

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

....Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE LISA GILLPresent: Ms. Deepa Jain, Advocate
for the petitioner.

LISA GILL, J.

Petitioner - Saradhu Ram, who states himself to be a member of The Dopalpur Multipurpose Co-operative Agricultural Service Society Limited - respondent No. 4, has filed the present writ petition for quashing of order dated 01.08.2014 (Annexure P-2) as well as dated 15.04.2015 (Annexure P-3).

Vide order dated 01.08.2014 (Annexure P-2) passed by the Deputy Registrar, Co-operative Societies, SBS Nagar, appeal filed by respondent No. 5 was decided. Respondent No. 5, who was placed under suspension from 27.02.2013 to 25.11.2013, challenged termination of his services by the Society. Order of his termination was upheld but it was directed that once the said respondent is entitled to DCRG and subsistence allowance or any other benefit, same should be paid within one month.

Petitioner preferred the revision petition against the said order arraying respondent No. 5 as well as respondent - Society,

Assistant Registrar and Deputy Registrar Co-operative Societies as respondents. Said revision petition was dismissed by the revisional authority specifically holding that respondent No. 5 is entitled for receipt of subsistence allowance under the Punjab State Co-operative Agricultural Service Society Rules (for short 'the rules') consequently affirming order dated 01.08.2014 passed by the Deputy Registrar Co-operative Societies.

Present petition has been filed challenging the above said orders.

Learned counsel for the petitioner is unable to show how the petitioner is competent to file the present writ petition. Admittedly, Society has not come forward to challenge the said decision. Furthermore, learned counsel for the petitioner is unable to point out any infirmity, illegality or perversity in the impugned order, which would warrant interference by this Court. Respondent No. 5 has been held entitled to receipt of subsistence allowance for the period of suspension as per Rule 3 (3) as well as Rule 13 (iv) of the rules. There is no ground to set aside this finding.

Consequently, there being no merit in this writ petition, same is dismissed.

October 09, 2015
rts

(Lisa Gill)
Judge