

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

112

CWP No.18037 of 2017 (O&M)

Date of Decision: September 05, 2017

Satinderjit Singh

....Petitioner

vs.

State of Punjab and another

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA

Present: Mr. Inderjit Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. T.P.S. Chawla, DAG, Punjab.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA, J. (Oral)

Petitioner while holding the substantive post of Trust Engineer, under the Local Government Department, State of Punjab, was given the current duty charge of the post of Superintending Engineer.

The instant petition was directed against the order dated 04.07.2017, whereby, the current duty charge of the higher post, was withdrawn.

The petition came up for preliminary hearing on 16.08.2017 and Mr. Inderjit Sharma, learned counsel representing the petitioner, made a statement that the petitioner is not aggrieved of the divesting of the current duty charge of the post of Superintending Engineer but the grievance is only to the effect

that as a consequence of the impugned order, the petitioner has to hold the substantive post of Trust Engineer and all the substantive posts of Trust Engineers across the State, already stand occupied and the petitioner has no post to man.

Mr. T.P.S. Chawla, learned State counsel, upon instructions from Mr. Rahul Jain, Senior Assistant, O/o Principal Secretary, Department of Local Bodies, makes a categoric statement that the petitioner upon the current duty charge having been divested is serving as Trust Engineer under Improvement Trust, Jalandhar and has also been paid salary of the post in question.

In the light of such categoric stand taken on behalf of the State, nothing survives in the instant petition and the same is disposed of as infructuous.

(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE

05.09.2017
anju rani

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