

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

Date of decision: 26.05.2016

CWP No.25740 of 2012 (O&M)

Nasib Singh & others

...Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab & others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV NARAIN RAINA

Present: Mr. Sapan Dhir, Advocate, for the petitioners.

Mr. Vaibhav Sharma, DAG, 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)

In CWP No.3665 of 2013 titled 'Surjit Singh Vs. State of Punjab & others' decided on 06.05.2016, I passed the following order:

"During the pendency of this writ petition, an Office Order dated 27.08.2015 has been passed by the Registrar, Co-operative Societies, Punjab, Chandigarh granting the petitioner the relief claimed.

As a result, the petition has been rendered infructuous.

However, there is some uncertainty as to whether the order has been implemented in letter and spirit by the subordinate office to the Registrar, Co-operative Societies, Punjab. In case, the implementation process is not concluded, the petitioner can approach the competent authority for expeditious grant of benefits flowing from the order dated 27.08.2015, in case they have not been disbursed in whole or in part. This Court has no doubt that the Registrar, Co-operative Societies, Punjab, Chandigarh will look into the matter personally and take such further decisions as are in accordance with law with directions to his

office to do so as expeditiously as practicable. If any monetary benefits become available because of the order, the same will be computed and handed over to the petitioner within three months of supply of order in certified copy. In case any consequential orders are required to be passed resulting from the basic order produced in Court today, the same will also be considered and appropriate decisions taken thereon within the same time frame.

Accordingly, the petition stands disposed of.”

Since the relief claimed is similar and identical to *Surjit Singh’s case*, the present petition is disposed of in the same terms.

Necessary changes be read *mutatis mutandis*.

26.05.2016
Vimal

[RAJIV NARAIN RAINA]
JUDGE