

206

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

CWP No.18513 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 18.05.2018

DR. SANDEEP SINGH (MEDICAL OFFICER) AND OTHERS

..... Petitioners

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASWANT SINGH

Present: Mr. Surinder Garg, Advocate for the petitioners.

Ms. Lavanya Paul, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab
for the respondents/State.

JASWANT SINGH, J. (ORAL)

The 21 petitioners, namely, *S/Shri/Smt. Sandeep Singh, Davinder Singh, Gagandeep Singh, Kusum, Gurpal Singh, Isha Gupta, Rohit Goyal, Lakhwinder Singh, Ekta, Rajan Mittal, Nisha Bhagat, Mohit Bansal, Sachin Goel, Sunita Aggarwal, Gill Manpreet Kaur, Kawaljit Kaur, Inderpreet Randhawa, Harkirat Gill, Pratima Chhabra, Munish Sagar and Parvinder Kaur*, were selected and appointed as Medical Officers (Punjab Civil Medical Service Class-II) in the Department of Health and Family Welfare, Punjab, in compliance of the selections conducted, pursuant to the advertisement in the year 2008-2009 (**Annexures P-1 & P-2**), respectively. The decision with regard to completion of their probation period and confirmation was kept pending due to the pendency of a vigilance inquiry with regard to the allegations of irregular and illegal selections.

By filing the present petition, the petitioners' claim that in view of the statutory rules, namely, *Punjab Civil Medical Service Class-II Rules, 1982*, they have completed the maximum period of three years probation and hence are entitled to the orders of confirmation and release of the annual increments w.e.f. the date of their appointments.

Upon notice, reply contesting the claim stands filed.

However, at the time of hearing, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the present petition has become infructuous, as the respondents in view of the decision of this Hon'ble Court rendered in *CWP No.11466 of 2013* titled as '**Dr. Arun Bansal and Others** versus **State of Punjab and Others**', decided on 02.08.2016 have since passed orders of completion of probation period. He, however, submits that the annual increments have not yet been released.

Learned State Counsel states that in compliance of the orders of probation, the grievance of legally admissible benefit of release of annual increments shall be redressed in due course of time, preferably within six months.

In view of the above, this petition is liable to be dismissed as infructuous.

Dismissed as infructuous.

The respondents/State shall be bound by their stand, as taken.

May 18, 2018

'rajneesh'

**(JASWANT SINGH)
JUDGE**

Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No