

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

CWP No.968 of 2017

Date of Decision:20.01.2017

Surender Kumar

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

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

Present : Mr. Arun Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

P.B. BAJANTHRI J.

The petitioner has questioned the validity of notice dated 27.12.2016 whereby the respondents have proposed to dispense the services of the petitioner.

In this regard, the petitioner has submitted reply. Presumption of the petitioner is that with reference to notice dated 27.12.2016, his services are likely to be dispensed.

Perusal of the show cause notice and reply shows that it is a premature writ petition.

Thus, the petitioner has not made out a case so as to interfere with the notice dated 27.12.2016 (Annexure P-4). However, the respondents are restrained in taking further action until and unless reply to the show cause notice is considered and speaking order is passed.

Accordingly, petition stands disposed of.

20.01.2017
rajeev

(P.B. Bajanthri)
Judge

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No