

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.8897 of 2016.

Date of Decision:-25.07.2017.

Jagdev Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P.B. BAJANTHRI

Present: Mr. Sunny Singla, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajesh Bhardwaj, Additional A.G. Punjab.

Mr. Viranjeet Singh Mahal, Advocate for
Mr. Pawan Kumar Mutneja, Advocate for
respondent No.6.

P.B. BAJANTHRI, J. (Oral)

In the present writ petition, petitioner has prayed for the following relief:-

“(ii) PETITION under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for the issuance of writ, order or direction especially in the nature of Mandamus directing the official Respondents to decide the case, title as Jagdev Singh V/s Glaxo Smithkline Consumer Healthcare, Ltd. pending before Labour Officer Nabha, expeditiously and kindly time bound the trial as the petitioner is still unemployed.”

In the present writ petition, petitioner has sought for a direction

Nos.4 and 5. In this regard, petitioner has not furnished any document to show that any application or petition which are stated to be pending consideration before the authorities. In the absence of material, question of issuing direction to the respondents does not arise.

Accordingly, writ petition stands dismissed reserving liberty to the petitioner to file a fresh petition by enclosing necessary application or petition.

(P.B. BAJANTHRI)
JUDGE

July 25, 2017.
sandeep sethi

Whether speaking/reasoned:-

Yes / No

Whether Reportable:-

Yes / No.