

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP No.24045 of 2014

Date of decision: February 04, 2016

Jai Bhagwan

..... Petitioner

Versus

Union Territory, Chandigarh and others

..... Respondents

CWP No.2258 of 2016

Date of decision: February 04, 2016

Ashok Kumar

..... Petitioner

Versus

Union Territory, Chandigarh and others

..... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M. JEYAPPAUL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH**

Present: Mr. Rohit Seth, Advocate
for the petitioner (in CWP No.24045 of 2014).

Mr. Sanjeev Manrai, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Gaurav Talwar, Advocate
for the petitioner (in CWP No.2258 of 2016).

Mr. Vivek Chouhan, Advocate
for the respondents.

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?

M. JEYAPPAUL, J. (ORAL)

As far as CWP No.24045 of 2014 and CWP No.2258 of 2016 are concerned, it is found that Union Territory, Chandigarh has already complied with the main order passed by the Tribunal and reduced the

quantum of punishment awarded to the writ petitioners in these writ petitions.

The learned counsel appearing for the writ petitioner in CWP No.24045 of 2014 and learned Senior counsel appearing for the writ petitioner in CWP No.2258 of 2016 seek permission to withdraw the writ petitions with liberty to challenge the modified punishment awarded to them in the impugned order passed by the Tribunal.

In view of the above submission, permission is granted as prayed for. Consequently, these two writ petitions namely CWP No.24045 of 2014 and CWP No.2258 of 2016 stand dismissed as withdrawn with the abovesaid liberty.

(M. JEYAPPAUL)
JUDGE

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

February 04, 2016
Dinesh Bansal