

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

CWP No. 10980 of 2013 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 08.09.2016

DEV NARAIN

... Petitioner

VS.

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present: Mr. N.K. Malhotra, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Naveen Sheoran, DAG, Haryana

Mr. Vikas Chatrath, Advocate,
for the respondent No. 3.

1. *Whether the Reporters of local newspaper may be allowed to see the judgment?*
2. *To be referred to the Reporter or not.*
3. *Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest?*

KULDIP SINGH, J. (Oral)

Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has received the payment recovered from him on account of commuted value of pension. Now, the learned counsel for the petitioner claims the legal fee for filing of the present writ petition.

On the other hand, the learned counsel for the respondent has contended that while making the payment to the petitioner on account of commuted value of pension, an excess amount of ₹ 10,336/- was made to him, however, this is not the subject matter of the present writ petition.

Since, the payment on account of commuted value of pension has already been made during the pendency of this writ petition, therefore, the present writ petition has become infructuous.

CWP No. 10980 of 2013 (O&M)

In view of the above, the present petition stands dismissed as having become infructuous.

Since, there was a bonafide dispute between the parties, no order as to costs.

September 8, 2016
Suresh Kumar

[KULDIP SINGH]
JUDGE

	✓		
<i>Whether speaking / reasoned</i>	<i>Yes</i>	/	<i>No</i>
			✓
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	<i>Yes</i>	/	<i>No</i>