

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

**C.W.P. No.12331 of 2017
Date of Decision: 24.01.2018**

Satish Kumar

..... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Punjab and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASWANT SINGH

Present: Mr. Peeush Gagneja, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Sunint Kaur, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

JASWANT SINGH, J. (Oral)

This Court, while issuing notice of motion on 01.06.2017, had passed the following order:-

“ It is the contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner, who is working as a Head Draftsman and at present, posted at Fazilka Division, is to retire on 31.10.2017. He intends to settle in Abohar and vide the impugned order dated 19.05.2017, he has been transferred to Kapurthala Division, which is more than 200 Kms. He further contends that as per the policy guidelines of the State, a person, who is to retire within a period of two year, should not be transferred especially when he intends to settle in the same place or area where he is posted.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Anant Kataria, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab, accepts notice. Counsel for the petitioner undertakes to supply five copies of the writ petition to the counsel for the State during the course of the day. Reply to the writ petition be filed within a period of six weeks.

List on 09.08.2017.

Status quo with regard to the place of posting, as it exists today, shall be maintained till the next date of hearing. ”

At the time of hearing, learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the present petition has become infructuous as the petitioner has since retired on attaining the age of superannuation.

Upon notice, learned State Counsel concedes the aforesaid factual position.

In view of above, the present writ petition is disposed of as infructuous.

January 24, 2018

Gagan

(JASWANT SINGH)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>