

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.3705 of 2016 (O&M)
DECIDED ON: NOVEMBER 14, 2017

CHANDER BHAN CHOPRA

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH

Present: Mr. Himanshu Raj, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. C.S. Bakshi, Additional Advocate General, Haryana.

None for respondents No. 2 and 3.

JASPAL SINGH, J (ORAL)

Through, instant civil writ petition preferred under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the petitioner has sought issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari to quash the order dated 05.10.2010 (Annexure P-3) whereby the petitioner was denied counting of his past service of HSMITC as qualifying service for pension.

2. The contention of learned counsel for the petitioner is that a joint representation by the petitioner and others was moved to the Chief Secretary Govt. of Haryana, Chandigarh as well as other authorities seeking relief of counting of service rendered by them previously in HSMITC towards pay pension and other retiral benefits. However, the claim put fourth by the

petitioner and others through the said representation was declined vide order dated 05.10.2010 (Annexure P-3).

3. The aforesaid order dated 05.10.2010 (Annexure P-3) was challenged by other petitioners in CWP No.3792 of 2012 as well as CWP No.11987 of 2015, in which, the present petitioner was not a party. Subsequently, the petitioner also challenged the said order dated 05.10.2010 (Annexure P-3) through instant petition. CWP No.3792 of 2012 as well as CWP No.11987 of 2015 have already been dealt with and disposed of by this Court vide judgment dated January 14, 2016 whereby the impugned order dated 05.10.2010 (Annexure P-3) has been set aside.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that respondents i.e. State of Haryana and others also preferred LPA No. 1804 of 2016, captioned as *“Haryana State Agricultural Marketing Board, Panchkula v. Subhash Arora and others”* against the judgment dated January 14, 2016 but that also stood dismissed.

5. Since, the benefit, which has been claimed through present petition by the petitioner has already been granted vide order dated January 14, 2016 passed in above referred Civil Writ Petitions, the instant petition is also disposed of in the terms of aforesaid Civil Writ Petitions.

NOVEMBER 14, 2017
sonika

(JASPAL SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned *Yes*

Whether reportable *Yes/No*