

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.7775 of 2016
Date of Decision:- 27.4.2016.

Rajinder Kumar and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab 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. Ranjivan Singh, Advocate for the petitioners.

P.B. BAJANTHRI, J.

The petitioner has not questioned Clause 18 of the appointment order dated 3.12.2007 by which it is made clear that his pensionary benefits would be considered as per new Scheme. However, he is seeking a direction with reference to earlier judgments of this Court to consider his grievance with reference to old Pension Scheme. He has not furnished any material to show the date of appointment of those petitioners and what are the conditions imposed in their appointment so as to seek the relief on par with the decision cited as Annexure P-4.

At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner seeks to withdraw the petition. He is permitted to do so reserving liberty to file

a fresh petition questioning the condition imposed in the appointment letter and other relief, if any.

Accordingly, the petition is dismissed as withdrawn.

(P.B. BAJANTHRI)
JUDGE

April 27, 2016.

sandeep sethi