

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

CWP No. 8807 of 2015(O&M)

Date of decision: 26.11.2015.

Union of India

...Petitioner

Versus

Narottam Das s/o late Sh.Fateh Chand and another

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.JEYAPPAUL.
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DASRHSAN SINGH.**

Present: Mr.Puneet Kumar Jindal, Sr.Advocate
with Mr. Siddhant Kant, Advocate
for the applicant-petitioner.

-*-

M.JEYAPPAUL, J.

CM No. 15270-CWP of 2015

Heard.

For the reasons set out in the application, the application is allowed and the applicant-petitioner is permitted to place on record additional affidavit of the petitioner.

CWP No.8807 of 2015.

The 1st respondent Narottam Das aggrieved by the order passed by the writ petitioner on 29.08.2014 withdrawing all cases and matters relating to Selection/Tender Committee and Arbitration etc. from his roster of work filed Original Application before the Tribunal. The Tribunal having noted down the fact that the name of the 1st respondent finds mention in the agreed/secret list prepared on 21.10.2014 in culmination of the joint meeting with CBI/Vigilance on 24.09.2014, observed that the work was withdrawn from the 1st respondent anticipating inclusion of his name in the

above list. In view of the above, the Tribunal held that the order passed by the writ petitioner on 29.08.2014 long prior to the inclusion of the 1st respondent in the agreed/secret list is not sustainable.

Learned senior counsel appearing for the writ petitioner referring to the additional affidavit placed on record in CM No. 15270-CWP of 2015 submitted that the 1st respondent was transferred from Railway Coach Factory, Kapurthala to Northern Central Railway, Allahabad and therefore, the question of reallocation of work to the 1st respondent who was earlier working at Railway Coach Factory, Kapurthala does not arise. In view thereof, it is submitted by learned senior counsel appearing for the writ petitioner that the order passed by the Tribunal has become unworkable and inexecutable and that, therefore, the writ petition has become infructuous.

Recording the above submissions, the writ petition stands disposed of as having become infructuous.

(M. JEYAPPAUL)
JUDGE

November 26, 2015
s.khan

(DASRHSAN SINGH)
JUDGE