

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

**C.M. No.375 of 2016 in/and
CWP No.12485 of 2015
Date of Decision:25.01.2016**

Raj Kumar ... Petitioner
Versus
State of Punjab & ors. ... Respondents

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

Present: Mr. HC Arora, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Harkesh Manuja, Addl.A.G., 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)

C.M. No.375 of 2016

This is an application for advancing the date of hearing of the case. Allowed as prayed for.

CWP No.12485 of 2015

It has been brought to the notice of the Court by Mr. Arora appearing for the petitioner that in the meantime and during the pendency of the petition, a termination order has been issued by the 2nd respondent, which has not yet been communicated to the petitioner so far. In case this is true, more likely than not the termination order will be conveyed in due course of time, if it has already not been. This turn of events gives rise to a fresh cause of action for which this petition is not geared to meet the challenge. When the termination order is received by the petitioner, he will be at liberty to impugn the same on all the grounds available

including those set up in this petition against issuance of a show cause notice. Consequently, the petition has been rendered infructuous and the same is disposed of as such with liberty to the petitioner to take recourse to law in case he is dissatisfied with the termination order.

**25.1.2016
monika**

**(RAJIV NARAIN RAINA)
JUDGE**