

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

**CWP-6114-1996 (O&M)
Date of decision:12.07.2017**

Dr. Meena Kumari

... Petitioner

Vs.

PAU, Ludhiana & others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.

Present: None.

...

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA, J.

The instant petition was instituted in the year 1996 assailing an order dated 01.02.1996 (Annexure P-9) and in terms of which private respondent No.9 had been appointed on the post of Assistant Acarologist. A writ of mandamus was also sought for directing the respondent/ Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana to appoint the petitioner on such post.

Order sheet would reveal that the petition had come up for hearing on different dates in the year 1996 and had been adjourned upon request made by counsel representing the petitioner.

Thereafter, on 19.07.1996, it was directed that the instant petition would come up after the decision of CWP No.2494-1995.

CWP No.2794 of 1995 (Santokh Singh & others Versus Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana and others) stands disposed of by a coordinate Bench of this Court in the following terms:

“Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that despite best efforts, he has been unable to contact the petitioners. He has further submitted that due to lapse of time, this petition might have been rendered infructuous.

Accordingly, this petition is disposed of as having been rendered infructuous. However, in case any cause of action still survives to the petitioners, they would be at liberty to seek revival of the petition.”

Since counsel for the petitioner was not appearing, Registry had put up the case and actual date notice had been issued to the petitioner.

Office report reveals that the notice issued to the petitioner has been received back unserved with a report that she is not residing at the given address.

It appears that by way of efflux of time, the petitioner is not interested to pursue the instant petition.

Accordingly, the instant petition is disposed of as having been rendered infructuous.

Liberty, however, is granted to the petitioner to move an appropriate application seeking revival of the petition upon demonstrating that cause of action still survives.

Disposed of accordingly.

12.07.2017

harjeet

**(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE**

- | | | |
|------|----------------------------|--------|
| (i) | Whether speaking/reasoned? | Yes/No |
| (ii) | Whether reportable? | Yes/No |