

**118 + 225 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

**CM No. 976 of 2015 in
CM No. 11901 of 2014 in/and
RA No. 516 of 2014 in
CWP No. 3672 of 2012
Date of Decision :29.01.2015**

Sukhdial Singh and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present : Mr.Jashanpreet Singh, AAG, Punjab
for the review petitioner-respondent State.
Mr.Anter Singh Brar, Advocate
Mr.C.L.Sharma, Advocate
for the non-applicant-petitioners.

- i. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
- ii. To be referred to the Reporters or not?
- iii. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

AJAY TEWARI, J. (Oral)

CM No. 976 of 2015

Learned counsel for the applicant-State of Punjab states that he
does not wish to press this application at this stage.

Dismissed as not pressed at this stage.

CM No. 11901 of 2015

This is an application for condonation of 884 days in filing the present review petition.

No reply has been filed to the application.

In the circumstances, for the reasons recorded in the application, the delay of 883 days in filing the present review petition is condoned.

CM stands disposed of.

RA No. 516 of 2014

This review petition has been filed on the ground that the facts of the case relied upon i.e. CWP No. 3677 of 2011 titled as Dr. Sohan Lal Bansal and others v. State of Punjab and another decided on 31.01.2012 were different and consequently this writ petition should not have been allowed merely on the contention of learned Assistant Advocate General. However, during arguments learned AAG has not been able to point out even from the review as to how the facts in the present case are different and how the petitioners in the present case are not identically situated to the petitioners in the aforesaid case. Learned counsel for the non-applicant-petitioners has pointed out that three cases were decided by the impugned order but review has been filed only in one case and the State has accepted the judgment in the other two cases.

In these circumstances the review petition is dismissed.

(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE

January 29, 2015
sunita