

HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-3201-2013

Date of Decision: March 27, 2017

Union of India and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

Vinod Prakash and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA KANT
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDIP AHLUWALIA

- | | | |
|----|---|---------|
| 1. | To be referred to the Reporters or not? | Yes/No |
| 2. | Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest? | Yes/No. |
| 3. | Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment? | Yes/No |

.....

Present: Mr.Pankaj Gupta, Sr.Panel counsel
for UOI for the petitioners.

Mr.Aman Chaudhary, Advocate with
Mr.R.S.Dadwal, Advocate
for respondent No.1
Ms.Deepali Puri, Advocate
for respondent No.2

.....

SURYA KANT, J.

In view of the fact that in two identical cases, i.e. one in CWP No.11981-CAT-2013 (Union of India and others vs Central Administrative Tribunal, Chandigarh and another) decided on 27.01.2017 and another CWP No.14795-2013 (Union of India and others vs Charan Dass and another) of even date, the authorities have implemented the Tribunal's orders coupled with the fact that the observations made by the Tribunal is one of the plausible view, we find no valid ground to deviate from the directions issued by the Tribunal.

The writ petition is accordingly disposed of with a direction that let the directions issued by the Tribunal directing the competent authority to grant consideration afresh be complied with on the analogy of Union of India and others vs Central Administrative Tribunal, Chandigarh and another and Charan Dass and others' cases (supra), and necessary benefit be granted to the first respondent as well.

(SURYA KANT)
JUDGE

March 27, 2017
meenuss

(SUDIP AHLUWALIA)
JUDGE

- | | | |
|----|-----------------------------|--------|
| 1. | Whether speaking/reasoned ? | Yes/No |
| 2. | Whether reportable ? | Yes/No |