

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

275

Decided on 27.9.2017

CWP-20336-2017(O&M)

SANJAY KUMAR & ORS

.....PETITIONERS

VS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

....RESPONDENTS

CWP-21213-2017 (O&M)

NAVEEN KUMAR & ORS

.....PETITIONERS

VS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present: Mr. Amit Jhanji, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Anil Mehta, DAG, Haryana.

AJAY TEWARI, J.(Oral)

On 7.9.2017 the following order was passed:

By this writ petition, the petitioners are claiming that they be given the same treatment as was given to the review applicants in RA No.298 of 2017 in CWP No.5867 of 2017. Many such cases had come before me in the past and all those matters were disposed of with a direction to the respondents to consider the claim of those petitioners in terms of the decision of the Division Bench in the aforesaid case.

Counsel for the petitioners informs the Court that though he could not be absolutely certain of this fact but the petitioners have informed him that despite numerous orders having been passed in this regard, the respondents are not granting temporary permits to any such person who had filed writ petitions subsequently

presumably on the premise that it was applicable only to those persons who were covered by the decision of the Division Bench.

In the circumstances, I deem it appropriate to issue notice of motion to the respondents. Ordered accordingly. On the asking of the Court, Mr. Anil Mehta, DAG Haryana accepts notice. Counsel for the petitioners undertakes to hand him over a copy of the writ petition during the course of the day.

Adjourned to 27.9.2017.

Mr. Anil Mehta, DAG, Haryana states that he has instructions from the respondents that the apprehension expressed by the petitioners on the last date was incorrect. Not only the petitioners but the other persons who are covered by the judgment in the Review application No. 298-2017 in CWP No. 5867-2017 will be considered for grant of temporary permits in terms of that decision.

Counsel for the petitioners states that in view of the statement of learned Deputy Advocate General, both the petitions may be dismissed as infructuous.

In the circumstances, both the petitions stand dismissed as such.

Since the main case has been decided, the pending civil miscellaneous application, if any, also stands disposed of.

27.9.2017
anuradha

(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	-	Yes/No
Whether reportable	-	Yes/No