

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.22453 of 2013

Date of Decision:- 1.6.2016.

Subhash Chand

.....Petitioner

Versus

Union of India and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P.B. BAJANTHRI

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

Present: Mr. Rajeev Anand, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Namit Kumar, Advocate for the respondents.

P.B. BAJANTHRI, J.

Pursuant to the order dated 16.5.2016, learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that petitioner was appointed in the month of May, 2016. Even though he was entitled to be appointed in the year 2013. Reserving liberty to the petitioner to agitate in respect of seniority and other monetary benefits by making necessary representation to the respondents, the petition is disposed of. The respondents are directed to consider the petitioner's representation/application within a period of three months from the date of its receipt.

**(P.B. BAJANTHRI)
JUDGE**

June 1, 2016.

sandeep sethi