

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

**COCN No.2390 of 2016
Date of decision: 23.02.2017**

Prithvi Raj

..Petitioner

Versus

Parveen Thind

..Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE DAYA CHAUDHARY

Present: Mr. Harpal Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Peeush Gagneja, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Nilesn Bhardwaj, DAG, Punjab
for the respondent.

Daya Chaudhary, J. (Oral)

Learned State counsel has filed reply in the Court and the same is taken on record.

Learned State counsel submits that the parties were not properly impleaded and because of the fault on the part of the petitioner, direction was issued to respondent No.2 but he was not competent authority. Subsequently, the order was conveyed to the competent authority and the same has been complied with vide order dated 17.02.2017, which is annexed as Annexure R-1/T with the reply.

Since the order has been passed, nothing remains in the present petition.

Disposed of accordingly.

However, in case, the petitioner is still aggrieved in any manner, he is at liberty to avail the appropriate remedy.

**23.02.2017
neetu**

**(DAYA CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned

√
Yes/No

Whether Reportable

√
Yes/No