

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

Date of Decision : 03.04.2018

CWP No.16768 of 2015

Manish

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

..... Respondents

CWP No.16914 of 2015

Jai Karan and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

..... Respondents

CWP No.16915 of 2015

Sahit and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI

Present: Mr. Mahesh Kumar Sangwan, Advocate for the petitioners.
Mr. Hitesh Pandit, Addl. A.G. Haryana.
Ms. Geeta Sharma, Advocate for respondents No.2 and 3.

ARUN PALLI, J. (Oral)

Learned counsel for the respondents submit that as the petitioners have since been offered employment, in lieu of the acquisition of their land holdings and they have even joined, nothing substantive survives in this petition.

The factual position, as set out above, is not disputed by learned counsel for the petitioners, except that claim of petitioner No.3, i.e.

Sandeep son of Dharamvir, in CWP No.16914 of 2015, has not been considered yet.

Learned counsel for respondents No.2 and 3, submits, for name of petitioner No.3 was not forwarded in the first list of 293 candidates, who were offered employment, there was no occasion to consider his claim. However, in the subsequent list sent by the Sub Divisional Officer (Civil), Jhajjar to Chief Executive Administration H.P.G.C.L. Panchkula on 17.4.2014, father's name of petitioner No.3, is reflected at serial No.3. Thus, upon instructions from Sh.Sombir, Assistant, she submits that if petitioner No.3, represents, within two weeks from today, to respondent No.2, upon such representation being made, his claim shall be considered and dealt with within a further period of four weeks. And, appropriate orders in accordance with law shall be passed.

That being so, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that let this petition be disposed of, in terms of the statement made by learned counsel for the respondents, for, the petitioner shall move an appropriate representation to the respondents/authorities.

The petition is accordingly disposed of, in the above terms. This Court is sanguine that in the event, the claim of the petitioner is declined by the respondents-authority, they shall pass a comprehensive order assigning reasons in support thereof.

03.04.2018

Manoj Bhutani

(ARUN PALLI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No