

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.26510 of 2015

Date of Decision:-19.12.2015.

Anil and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA KANT
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P.B. BAJANTHRI**

- 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. Lekh Raj Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

SURYA KANT, J. (ORAL)

- 1.) Notice of motion to respondent Nos.1 to 5 only.
- 2.) On our asking, Mr. Anil Mehta, learned Deputy Advocate General, Haryana accepts notice on their behalf. Let five copies of the writ petition be supplied to the State counsel during the course of the day failing which this order shall be automatically recalled and the writ petition shall be deemed to have been dismissed for non-prosecution.
- 3.) Since no order prejudicial to the interest of respondent No.6 is being passed, it is not necessary to issue notice to the said respondent.

4.) After hearing learned counsel for the parties, it transpires that the identical controversy has already been resolved by this Court in **CWP No.10446 of 2015** titled **“Om Parkash Vs. State of Haryana and others”** decided on 13.10.2015.

5.) For the reasons already assigned in **CWP No.10446 of 2015** titled **“Om Parkash Vs. State of Haryana and others”** decided on 13.10.2015, the instant writ petition is also disposed of in the same terms.

**(SURYA KANT)
JUDGE**

**(P.B. BAJANTHRI)
JUDGE**

December 19, 2015.

sandeep sethi