

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

RA-CW-107-2017
in CWP-19031-2014 (O&M)
Date of decision: 28.07.2017

Darshna Bansal

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Kuldeep Singh

Present: Mr. Sameer Sachdeva, Advocate for the
applicants/ respondent nos. 3 and 4

1. *Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers may be allowed to see the judgment ?*
2. *To be referred to the Reporters or not ?*
3. *Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?*

Kuldeep Singh, J. (Oral)

Heard.

Present application has been filed seeking review of the judgment dated 6.2.2017, passed by this Court in a bunch of writ petitions.

Learned counsel for the applicants states that regarding the gratuity, findings have been recorded against the University Calender. Learned counsel for the applicants has also referred to interim order passed by the Apex Court in SLP No. 13110 of 2008 dated 26.11.2013, wherein while remanding cases, certain directions were issued in certain writ petitions. It is stated that those writ petitions are pending before a Single Bench and the judgment of this case will come in way of decision on those cases. Learned counsel for the applicants further states that he was under

the bona fide impression that the matter has been adjourned. Therefore, he did not argue the matter on merits.

After considering the facts and circumstances, I am of the view that the fact that the counsel did not argue the matter under bona fide belief, is factually incorrect. Judgment shows that it was a bunch of writ petitions which were heard in detail and all the contentions raised by all the counsels were considered and the judgment was pronounced. Therefore, all the contentions raised by learned counsel for the applicants were heard. Therefore, under one or the other pretext, matter cannot be re-opened to overturn the findings recorded in the judgment. The applicants, if so aggrieved, can always file an appeal against the judgment of this Court and press all the legal grounds. There is no error apparent on the record.

The review application stands dismissed accordingly.

28.07.2017
gk

(Kuldip Singh)
Judge

Whether speaking/ reasoned:	Yes
Whether Reportable:	No