

IN THE PUNJAB & HARYANA HIGH COURT AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-25677-2016

Date of decision : 31.07.2017

Vishnu

... Petitioner

Versus

Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Ltd. and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Mr.M.L.Saini, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr.Hitesh Pandit, Addl.A.G. Haryana.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J.(ORAL)

Though learned counsel for the respondent-Corporation is not present, it is being 4.15 p.m., and matter has been taken up out of turn on the request of Mr.Saini, he points to paragraph 5 of the reply filed on behalf of the Corporation, in which it is stated that the case of the petitioner is similar in nature to that of Mukesh Kumar who had filed CWP no.14823 of 2011, which was decided while relying upon the judgment in '***Garima Jindal vs. HVPNL***' (CWP no.13384 of 2011).

In view of the aforesaid stand taken by the respondents in their reply, this petition is also disposed of in the same terms as CWP no.14823 of 2011, decided along with other petitions on 26.05.2014, a copy of the said judgment being annexed as Annexure P8 with the present petition.

The case of the petitioner in terms of the decision in ***Garima***

Jindals' case, would be decided by passing a speaking order within a period of two months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

July 31, 2017.
Davinder Kumar

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