

**THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**COCN No.2838 of 2016
Date of Decision:22.12.2016**

R.K. Karwasra Petitioner

Vs.

Rakesh Gupta & anr. Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR JAIN

Present:- Mr. Gunjan Mehta, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ramesh Hooda, Advocate for respondent No.1.

Mr. Mani Ram Verma, Advocate for respondent No.2.

RAKESH KUMAR JAIN, J.(Oral)

Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that in the lists Annexure P.3 and Annexure P.4, respondent No.2 is shown at Sr. No.10 but in the list Annexure P.4, respondent No.2 is placed at No.4. He has also submitted that respondent No.2 has been given officiating charge of Dean, Academic Affairs of the University vide order dated 11.5.2016 though respondent No.2 is junior to him.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent No.1 has submitted that neither list Annexure P.3 nor Annexure P.4 are the seniority lists. Rather these are the lists prepared for the convenience of the work to be taken from the respective doctors and the order dated 11.5.2016 was passed much before the order dated 5.09.2016 was passed by this Court.

I have heard counsel for the parties and after examining the record, am of the considered opinion that the concern of the petitioner is

over as soon as counsel for respondent No.1 has made the statement at the bar that lists Annexures P.3 and P.4 are not the seniority lists to determine that the petitioner is junior to respondent No.2. As regards the order dated 11.5.2016 is concerned, it was passed much before the order dated 5.10.2016 was passed. Consequently, the present petition has no merit and the same is hereby dismissed.

Rule discharged.

December 22, 2016
renu

(RAKESH KUMAR JAIN)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No