

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

IOIN-CWP No. 25185 of 2015

Date of decision: 05.05.2017

Adesh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present: None.

JAISHREE THAKUR, J. (ORAL)

The above noted writ petition has been filed seeking to quash the order dated 04.02.2015 (Annexure P-7) by which the claim of the petitioner has been rejected for employment as per the policy dated 18.11.1993 (Annexure P-1) with a further prayer for issuance of a mandamus directing the respondents to provide employment to the petitioner.

The State of Punjab had decided to construct a Dam over River Ravi situated in the State of Punjab and huge chunks of land from the States of Himachal Pradesh, Jammu & Kashmir and Punjab were acquired. The State of Punjab framed policy for rehabilitation and resettlement of the oustees of Ranjit Sagar Dam on 18.11.1993. As per the policy, one eligible member of the family, whose land had been acquired, would have been provided employment by the State Government. It is contended that land measuring 69 Kanals 9 Marlas belonging to the father of the petitioner was acquired under notification under Section 6 of the Land Acquisition Act

dated 28.11.1975. Since the petitioner was not given employment, he preferred a writ petition in this Court which was disposed of with a direction to the respondents to consider the claim of the petitioner. On consideration, the claim of the petitioner was rejected by impugned order dated 04.02.2015 (Annexure P-7) on the ground that the father of the petitioner was not owner as on cut of date of 01.05.1986. Aggrieved, the instant writ petition has been filed.

The matter was initially taken up for hearing on 03.12.2015 on which date learned counsel for the petitioner sought time to produce on record the attested copies of jamabandis for the year 1971-72 to establish the fact that father of the petitioner owned land entitling the petitioner herein to be offered appointment in terms of the policy. However, when the matter was taken up on 08.01.2016, the matter was adjourned sine die to enable the counsel for the petitioner to place on record the jamabandis. The matter was listed on 07.03.2017, on which date proxy counsel for the petitioner requested for an adjournment. In the interest of justice, the matter was posted for 05.05.2017 giving last opportunity to the counsel for the petitioner to argue the matter. Case is being called today and there is no representation. It appears that the petitioner is no longer interested in pursuing the matter, hence, the same is hereby dismissed on account of non-prosecution.

05.05.2017

Satyawan

Whether speaking/reasoned

Whether reportable

**(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE**

Yes.

No.