

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

CWP No.25582 of 2015 (O&M)

Date of Decision: May 17, 2017

Baba Farid University Employees Welfare Association, Punjab (Regd.)
through its President

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present:- Ms. G.K. Mann, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Lavanya Paul, AAG Punjab.

Mr. Karan Singh Sandhu, Advocate
for respondent No.3.

JAISHREE THAKUR, J. (Oral)

The instant writ petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari to quash appointment of respondent No.4 as Assistant Registrar/Deputy Registrar and Joint Registrar.

The basic grievance that arises in this writ petition is the appointment of respondent No.4-Satpal Singh as Joint Registrar with Baba Farid University of Health and Sciences, Faridkot. It is contended in the writ petition that respondent No.4 was given appointment as Joint Registrar,

without any interview/test being held and also got financial benefits in violation of Punjab CSR Rules 10-22(1), 10-22(4) and 10-22(6).

Mr. Karan Singh Sandhu, learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent No.3- Baba Farid University of Health and Sciences, Faridkot submits that respondent No.4, who had joined as Joint Registrar on deputation with respondent No.3 has since been repatriated to its parent Department i.e. Education Department, Chandigarh Administration by letter dated 07.04.2017 and stands relieved from that date itself. He also places on record copy of said orders, which are taken on record as Mark 'X'.

In view of the fact that respondent No.4 stands repatriated, no further orders are called for in this writ petition.

At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that any undue benefit that has been given to respondent No.4 should be ordered to be recovered from him.

This court is not inclined to get into this controversy. In case, the petitioner has any grievance and they are of the opinion that respondent No.4 has been given unjust benefits, they are at liberty to avail whatever remedy available with them, either by approaching the University or by approaching the civil court for recovery of the same.

The writ petition stands disposed of accordingly.

May 17, 2017
vijay saini

(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No