

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CM-7648-CWP-2017 and CM-7649-CWP-2017 in
Review Application No. 271 of 2017 in
CWP No. 7582 of 2017 (O/M)
Date of decision : 24.5.2017

Naginder Singh and others Petitioner (s)

Versus

State of Punjab and others Respondent (s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Vivek Aggarwal, Advocate, for the 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-7648-CWP-2017

Application is allowed, as prayed for.

Application is disposed of.

CM-7649-CWP-2017

Documents (Annexures-P-X to P-Z) are taken on record.

Application is disposed of.

RA-271-2017

This is an application filed under Order 47 Rule 1 read with Section 151 of Code of Civil Procedure for review of the order dated 18.4.2017, passed by this Court in CWP No. 7582 of 2017, vide which the said writ petition was dismissed, recording that the recoveries were effected on 1.1.2006, 1.1.2007 and 1.7.2007 and the writ petition was filed after 10/11 years.

CM-7648-CWP-2017 and CM-7649-CWP-2017 in
Review Application No. 271 of 2017 in
CWP No. 7582 of 2017 (O/M)

The learned counsel for the applicants-petitioners has stated that on account of mistake on his part, he could not point out that these are the periods, for which the recoveries are effected, which were infact effected in the year 2011. Further, he has pointed out the internal communications between the District Treasury Officer, Sangrur, and the Government, in which the clarification was sought in the year 2012 regarding the said recoveries. It is stated that the Government has not given the clarification so far. It is stated that thereafter the applicants-petitioners have made the representations.

I am of the view that even if the recoveries are of year 2011, the writ petition was filed after 6 years. The making of repeated representation will not extend right to the applicants-petitioners. The writ petition was rightly held to be barred by delay and laches. Hence, the present review application is dismissed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

24.5.2017
sjks

Whether speaking / reasoned : Yes

Whether Reportable : No