

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

569

CWP-18436-2006 (O&M)
Date of decision: August 03, 2018

Gunwanjit Kaur

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CWP-18717-2006 (O&M)

Jaspinder Singh Randhawa

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CWP-17004-2006 (O&M)

Satinder Paul Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CWP-17128-2006 (O&M)

Sukhdeep Kaur

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.B. CHAUDHARI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH**

Present: Mr. Parveen Kumar, Advocate
Mr. R.P.S. Bara, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Anju Arora, Addl. A.G. Punjab.

Ms. Aparna Singhal, Advocate for
Mr. Avnish Mittal, Advocate for respondent No.6.

A.B. CHAUDHARI, J.

This order shall dispose of four Writ petitions i.e. CWP-18436-2006 titled as Gunwanjit Kaur vs. State of Punjab and others, CWP-18717-2006 titled as Jaspinder Singh Randhawa vs. State of Punjab and others, CWP-17004-2006 titled as Satinder Paul Singh vs. State of Punjab and others and CWP-17128-2006 titled as Sukhdeep Kaur vs. State of Punjab and others.

Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) seek adjournment. In order to consider the merits of the matter, we have perused the petition and subject matter of the petition. The challenge is against advertisement dated 15.09.2006 inviting applications for 62 posts of Assistant District Attorneys by the Prosecution & Litigation Department, Punjab on contract basis (Annexure P-13). Term No.5 thereof reads thus:-

“The period of contract will be one year. However, it will be terminable at any time by giving one month's notice on either side or contract fee for that period in lieu thereof.”

It is clear from the advertisement that the period of contract was only for one year. Though, learned counsel for respondent No.6 makes a statement that there might be extension thereafter, but there is nothing on record. We find that the petition does not have any amendment to challenge extension, if any. In other words, as per term No.5 of the advertisement contract period was of one year. Hence, we do not think the petition any more survives.

We therefore make the following order:-

ORDER

(i)CWP Nos.18436, 18717, 17004 & 17128 of 2006, are
disposed of as infructuous.

(ii)No order as to costs.

(A.B. CHAUDHARI)
JUDGE

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

August 03, 2018
anju rani

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