

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

Civil Writ Petition No.5801 of 2013
Date of Decision: March 19, 2015

Shimla Rani

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana & others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL, JUDGE

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.Sandeep Punchhi, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr.Rari Pratap Singh, AAG, Haryana,
for the State.

AMIT RAWAL, J. (Oral

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the grievance of the petitioner in the present writ petition was to challenge the selection of respondent No.5 to the post of Anganwari Worker. However, during the pendency of the writ petition, respondent No.5 has been removed from service as per Annexure R-5. Therefore, the cause of action in the present writ petition no longer survives and the writ petition is rendered infructuous.

In view of the statement made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the present writ petition is disposed of as infructuous.

March 19, 2015
ramesh

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE