

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

CWP No.12255 of 2016

Date of decision: 4.7.2016

Kusum

... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Haryana & ors.

... Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Satbir Gill, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

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

RAJIV NARAIN RAINA, J.(Oral)

A selection process which came to an end in 2011 has been challenged in this petition brought in 2016. The same is hereby dismissed on the ground of delay and laches. It is not an argument of substance that since another writ petition is pending motion hearing, even if it was filed in 2016, therefore process should be issued to connect this case with the other. That petition may meet with the same fate as this. If a suit was brought on the same cause of action to claim similar relief, it would patently be barred by time. If a suit is barred, it would not be prudent to issue discretionary writ for enforcement of a dead right. See State of Madhya Pradesh v. Bhailal Bhai, AIR 1964 SC 1006.

**(RAJIV NARAIN RAINA)
JUDGE**

4.7.2016
monika