

101 + 242

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 20059 of 2016 (O/M)

Date of decision : 21.3.2017

Raj Kumari

..... Petitioner (s)

Versus

State of Punjab and others

..... Respondent (s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. R.K. Arora, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. R.S. Pathania, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.
Mr. G.S. Sirphikhi, Advocate, for applicants in
CM-16302-CWP-2016, CM-16303-CWP-2016,
CM-673-CWP-2017, CM-674-CWP-2017.

1. Whether the Reporters of local newspaper may be allowed to see the judgment ?
 2. To be referred to the Reporter or not.
 3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ?
- . - .-

KULDIP SINGH J. (ORAL)

The learned counsel for the petitioner states that he has instructions to withdraw the present writ petition.

On the other hand, the learned counsel for applicants-intervenors, who has filed an application under Order 1 Rule 10 CPC read with Section 151 CPC for impleadment of applicants-intervenors in the present writ petition as respondents No. 4 and 5, says that the benefit of family pension has been released to the petitioner and nothing has been given to applicants-intervenors and they want to avail the legal remedy.

Since the petitioner does not press the present writ petition, the same is dismissed as withdrawn. The applicants-intervenors are always at liberty to take recourse of law, as they deemed fit.

Since the main case stands disposed of, all the pending applications also stand disposed of as such.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

21.3.2017
sjks

Whether speaking / reasoned : No

Whether Reportable : No