

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH
232

CWP No.25028 of 2013

Date of Decision:11.05.2015

Anil Chanana & others

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI.

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?

Present: Mr.Sunny Singla, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr.Pankaj Mulwani, DAG, Punjab,

ARUN PALLI, J.(oral)

The precise stand set-out in paragraph 3 of the preliminary submissions of the affidavit filed by the Assistant Director(S.A.3), office of Director of Public Instruction(Secondary Education), Punjab, reveals that the petitioners were entitled to the benefit of Assured Career Progression Scheme(ACP) on completion of 8, 16, 24 and 32 years of service or on completion of 4, 9 and 14, as the case may be, and as the position was prior to promulgation of Rules, 2011, which have since been repealed. And, this was never the claim of the petitioners that they were denied the benefit under ACP Scheme, which was in vogue in the past. That being so, with restoration of the earlier ACP Scheme, the grievance of the petitioners raised in this petition stands redressed. And, thus, the matter in hand has become infructuous.

Learned counsel for the petitioners fairly concedes this position and submits that the matter be disposed of as having become infructuous.

Disposed of as having become infructuous.

May 11, 2015
seema

(ARUN PALLI)
JUDGE