

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.7275 of 1998

Date of Decision: 02.05.2016

Santokh Singh-I

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

... Respondents

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

Present: Mr. R.S. Bajaj, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Harkesh Manuja, Addl. AG, Punjab.

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

RAJIV NARAIN RAINA, J.(Oral)

Mr. Bajaj relies on the decision of this Court in CWP No.15875 of 1992 titled *Santokh Singh and others v. The State of Punjab and others* and connected case which were allowed on January 13, 2014 in favour of the petitioners therein. The fate of the present case was tied with the outcome of the aforesaid case. The Court had directed liberty to the department to pass a fresh order after hearing and deciding objections filed by the effected parties. The petition is allowed for violation of principles of *audi alteram partem*. After hearing the objections, the Government has agreed with the view in the objections.

Mr. Bajaj is not aware of the order passed by the Government in that case. However, he is *ad idem* that his client's case to be considered in the same line and, therefore, the order proposed to be passed in this case to

club the fate of this petition with the result of the directions issued by this Court in *Santokh Singh's* case. In case, the orders passed in *Santokh Singh's* case have not been implemented for any reason whatsoever then the case of the petitioner would be heard and clubbed with those matters. In case, the relief has been granted in those cases then the same relief be granted to the petitioner within a period of *two months* from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

The petition stands disposed of with the above observations and directions. In case, the decision is against the petitioner then he would have liberty to approach this Court again.

(RAJIV NARAIN RAINA)
JUDGE

02.05.2016
manju