

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

**CWP No. 19522 of 2017  
Date of decision: 03.10.2017**

**Joginder Singh**

**...Petitioner**

**Versus**

**State of Haryana and Others**

**...Respondents**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH**

Present: None.

\*\*\*\*

**AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J.(ORAL)**

Vide an order dated 30.08.2017, when this Court was not inclined to entertain the petition for the reason given in the above-said order, learned counsel for the petitioner had sought time to argue the matter in detail.

Consequently, it was adjourned to 07.09.2017, on which date he sought time to produce a judgment to show that even though the petitioner had been working for more than 10 years(on contractual basis) and despite his being 46 years of age, he could still be considered to be a dependent of an ex-serviceman.

The matter was then adjourned to 14.09.2017, on which date again learned counsel sought an adjournment. This petition having been adjourned to today, with it stated in the aforesaid order that if it is not argued it would be deemed to have been dismissed-in-default, today, even on second call, none is present. Hence, the order dated 14.09.2017 becomes operative.

The petition is dismissed-in-default.

**October 03, 2017**  
**Poonam (II)**

**(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)  
JUDGE**

*Whether speaking/reasoned:*  
*Whether reportable:*

*Yes/No*  
*Yes/No*