

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

**CM-16621-CWP-2016 in/and
RA-CW-428-2016 in CWP-21795 of 2014
Date of decision : January 09, 2017**

Vinod C. Nanda and others Petitioners

Versus

Vice Chancellor Punjab University and another

.... Applicants- -Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Ravi Chadda, Advocate for the applicants-respondents.

Mr. S.P.S. Mann, Advocate for the non-applicants/petitioners.

1. Whether the Reporters of local newspaper may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not.
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ?

KULDIP SINGH J. (ORAL)

CM-16621-CWP-2016

There is delay of 55 days in filing the review application.

For the reasons mentioned in the application, delay of 55 days in filing the review application is condoned, subject to all just exception.

Application stands disposed of.

RA-CW-428-2016

Heard.

Applicants-respondents claim the review of the order dated 26.09.2016 passed in CWP No.21795 of 2014.

It comes out that on the date fixed, learned counsel for the applicants-respondents was not present. However, the case of the applicants-respondents was considered and the matter was decided. Now, the applicants-respondents want to put forward certain plea regarding the

Regulation 3.9 of the Punjab University Employees (Pension) 1991 Regulations.

It would amount to re-opening of the case. There is no error apparent on the record.

Hence, dismissed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

January 09, 2017

sarita

Whether speaking / reasoned Yes

Whether Reportable: No