

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

**L.P.A. No.2077 of 2014 (O&M)
Decided on : 10.07.2017**

Gurnek Singh Brar

... Appellant

Versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE MAHESH GROVER
HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE RAJ SHEKHAR ATTRI**

Present : Mr. Rajiv Atma Ram, Senior Advocate, with
Mr. Nishant Bhardwaj, Advocate,
for the appellant.

Mr. Manoj Bajaj, Addl. AG, Punjab,

Mr. Naveen S. Bhardwaj, Advocate,'
for PSPCL.

Mr. Ishaan Bhardwaj, Advocate,
for respondent No.3.

MAHESH GROVER, J.

The appellant had challenged the extension granted to respondent No.3 as also enhancement in age of retirement.

It is not disputed before us that the incumbent has since resigned and abandoned his assignment.

In view of this, we are of the opinion that the present LPA has been rendered infructuous and is disposed of as such leaving the question of extension in age as also extension granted to be answered if

at all, such a situation arises at any point of time in future. For the present, determination of this issue is merely academic.

While considering the matter, we deem it appropriate to waive off the cost imposed on the appellant by the learned Single Judge vide order dated 9.10.2014.

(MAHESH GROVER)
JUDGE

(RAJ SHEKHAR ATTRI)
JUDGE

July 10, 2016

Paritosh Kumar

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No