

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

CWP No.918 of 1996 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 31.5.2016

Gurdial Singh and others

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

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

Present: Mr.Amit Chopra, Advocate for the petitioners

Mr.Piyush Bansal, DAG, Punjab

Ms. Harmanpreet Kaur, Advocate for

Ms.Alka Chatrath, Advocate for respondents no.3 to 46

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

RAJIV NARAIN RAINA, J. (Oral)

It is no longer possible or arguable to examine the validity of selection made two decades ago to the post of Zileedars in the Irrigation Department of Punjab. Mr.Amit Chopra, learned counsel for the petitioners vehemently submits that the writ petition should not be rendered defunct by passage of time and the rights of the petitioners should be declared on the date of filing of the writ petition. His submission is that the petitioners were wrongly ignored by placing the age bar against them while it was granted to the private respondents.

The State in its written statement has defended its action on the touchstone of relaxation in age accorded to the private respondents by the competent authority in terms of rules. Even though rights of parties are to be declared on the date of the writ petition, but the present matter is such that by passage of time, it loses meaning in human affairs.

For the foregoing reasons, I find no merit in this petition which is accordingly dismissed.

**(RAJIV NARAIN RAINA)
JUDGE**

31.5.2016