

CWP No.18038 of 1995
CWP No.1699 of 1996
CWP No.10497 of 1995

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

1. CWP No.18038 of 1995

Karnail Singh and others ... Petitioners
Versus
The State of Punjab and another ... Respondents

2. CWP No.1699 of 1996

Kartar Chand and others ... Petitioners
Versus
State of Punjab and others ... Respondents

3. CWP No.10497 of 1995

Ved Parkash and others ... Petitioners
Versus
The State of Punjab and others ... Respondents

Date of Decision: 06.05.2016

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV NARAIN RAINA

Present: Ms. Anu Dutta, Advocate,
for Mr. Jaspal Singh Maanipur, Advocate,
for the petitioners in CWP No.18038 of 1995.

Mr. Hitesh Kumar Sammi, Advocate,
for Mr. Nand Lal Sammi, Advocate,
for the petitioners in CWP No.10497 of 1995.

None for the petitioners in CWP No.1699 of 1996.

Mr. Harkesh Manuja, Addl. AG, Punjab.

CWP No.18038 of 1995
CWP No.1699 of 1996
CWP No.10497 of 1995

-2-

1. To be referred to the Reporters or not?
2. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

RAJIV NARAIN RAINA, J.(Oral)

This order will dispose of CWP No.18038 of 1995 titled *Karnail Singh and others v. The State of Punjab and another*, CWP No.1699 of 1996 titled *Kartar Chand and others v. State of Punjab and others* & CWP No.10497 of 1995 titled *Ved Parkash and others v. The State of Punjab and others*.

CWP No.18038 of 1995

Relief has been granted to the petitioners and the matter has been rendered infructuous.

Dismissed as having been rendered infructuous.

CWP No.1699 of 1996
CWP No.10497 of 1995

However, in connected CWP No.10497 of 1995 learned counsel for the petitioners is not in touch with his clients and, therefore, is not in a position to make a statement whether the matter has been rendered infructuous. In CWP No.1699 of 1996 learned counsel for the petitioners is not present.

In view of CWP No.18038 of 1995 which has been rendered infructuous in all likelihood these petitions should suffer the same fate.

These petitions are disposed of as having been rendered infructuous. However, in case, the petitioners have subsisting grievance of the cause of action against which they approached Court in these petitions.

They would have to move an application for revival of the petition for

CWP No.18038 of 1995
CWP No.1699 of 1996
CWP No.10497 of 1995

-3-

consideration of prayers that they may wish to make.

(RAJIV NARAIN RAINA)
JUDGE

06.05.2016
manju