

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

(1) CRM-M-32013 of 2016
Date of decision:-16.8.2017

Atul Shorewala ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana through Labour Inspector, Sonapat ...Respondent

(2) CRM-M-32014 of 2016

Atul Shorewala ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana through Labour Inspector, Sonapat ...Respondent

(3) CRM-M-32015 of 2016

Atul Shorewala ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana through Labour Inspector, Sonapat ...Respondent

(4) CRM-M-32016 of 2016

Atul Shorewala ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana through Labour Inspector, Sonapat ...Respondent

(5) CRM-M-32017 of 2016

Atul Shorewala ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana through Labour Inspector, Sonapat
...Respondent

(6) CRM-M-32018 of 2016

Atul Shorewala
...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana through Labour Inspector, Sonapat
...Respondent

(7) CRM-M-32019 of 2016

Atul Shorewala
...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana through Labour Inspector, Sonapat
...Respondent

(8) CRM-M-32020 of 2016

Atul Shorewala
...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana through Labour Inspector, Sonapat
...Respondent

(9) CRM-M-32021 of 2016

Atul Shorewala
...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana through Labour Inspector, Sonapat
...Respondent

(10) CRM-M-32022 of 2016

Atul Shorewala
...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana through Labour Inspector, Sonapat
...Respondent

- (11)

CRM-M-32023 of 2016

Atul Shorewala

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana through Labour Inspector, Sonapat

...Respondent
- (12)

CRM-M-32024 of 2016

Atul Shorewala

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana through Labour Inspector, Sonapat

...Respondent
- (13)

CRM-M-32025 of 2016

Atul Shorewala

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana through Labour Inspector, Sonapat

...Respondent
- (14)

CRM-M-32026 of 2016

Atul Shorewala

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana through Labour Inspector, Sonapat

...Respondent
- (15)

CRM-M-32204 of 2016

Atul Shorewala

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana through Labour Inspector, Sonapat

...Respondent
- (16)

CRM-M-32212 of 2016

Atul Shorewala

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana through Labour Inspector, Sonapat

...Respondent

CORAM : HON' BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. MADAAN

Present : None for the petitioner (s).

Mr.Neeraj Poswal, AAG, Haryana.

H.S. MADAAN, J.

Vide this judgment, I propose to dispose of sixteen petitions i.e. **CRM-M-32013 to CRM-M-32026-2016, CRM-M-32204 of 2016 and CRM-M-32212 of 2016** filed by petitioner – Atul Shorewala seeking quashing of the orders passed by learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Sonapat dated 22.2.2013 as Annexure P-1 and order dated 23.2.2013 as Annexure P2 vide which the objections of the petitioner were dismissed and for quashing of the order of the revisional Court dated 3.6.2013 (Annexure P-3) vide which order passed by the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Sonapat was upheld.

Learned State counsel submits that as per communications sent by the Labour Commissioner, Haryana, Chandigarh to the office of the Advocate General, Haryana, Chandigarh, the complaints in question have since been withdrawn from the Court of Chief Judicial Magistrate, Sonapat. He has placed on file copies of that communications. The same are taken on record.

Learned State counsel submits that since in terms of these communications, the complaints have been withdrawn from the Court of Chief Judicial Magistrate, Sonapat, these petitions have become

infructuous and be disposed of accordingly.

I find force in this contention. Since the complaints, in which the impugned order were passed, by which the petitioner felt aggrieved are no longer there, having been withdrawn by the complainant, the present petitions have also become infructuous and are dismissed accordingly.

16.8.2017
Brij

(H.S.MADAAN)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No