

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

Civil Writ Petition No.7518 of 1996

Date of Decision: November 23, 2016

The Workers Union Shahabad Cooperative Sugar Mill

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana & Ors.

...Respondents

Civil Writ Petition No.16626 of 1996

Ganna Udpadhak Association, Shahabad Markanda

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana & Ors.

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK

Present: None for the petitioner.

Mr.Sandeep Mann, Sr.DAG, Haryana.

Mr.C.B.Goel, Advocate, for respondent No.3.

Mr.Jaivir Yadav, Advocate, for respondent No.4.

Mr.Abhishek Dhull, Advocate, for

Mr.Amit Jain, Advocate, for respondent No.6.

RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK, J.(Oral)

Instant order proposes to dispose of these two identical writ petitions, bearing CWP No.7518 of 1996, titled as “*The workers Union*

Shahabad Cooperative Sugar Mills Ltd. vs. *State of Haryana & Ors.*” and

CWP No.16626 of 1996, titled as “*Ganna Udpadhak Association, Shahabad*

Markanda vs. State of Haryana & Ors.”, as both these writ petitions arise out of the same controversy. However, for the facility of reference, facts have been culled out from CWP No.7518 of 1996.

Petitioners, in both writ petitions, seek writ of Mandamus, directing the respondent-State to entrust the investigation of FIR No.73 dated 29.03.1996 under Sections 408, 420, 467 & 471, IPC, registered at Police Station, Shahabad, to the Central Bureau of Investigation.

Notice of motion was issued, vide order dated 12.08.1996 passed by a Division Bench of this Court. Written statements were filed. Thereafter, both writ petitions were admitted for regular hearing, vide order dated 24.07.1997 passed by the Division Bench of this Court. That is how, this Court is seized of the matter.

Learned counsel for the State as well as learned counsel for the private respondents submit that after conclusion of the investigation, police report under Section 173 Cr.P.C., was presented to the learned Court of competent jurisdiction, in the year 1997, to be precise 08.02.1997. This fact has gone undisputed before this Court.

In view of the above said undisputed fact situation obtaining on record of both these cases, hardly any issue is left to be decided at the hands of this Court. It is so said, because said criminal trial would have been concluded long back.

In view of the above, both these writ petitions are disposed of, as

having been rendered infructuous.

November 23, 2016
seema

(RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>