

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-32082-2018

Date of decision: 15.12.2018

Om Parkash Tomar

...Petitioner

Versus

Ch. Charan Singh Haryana Agriculture  
University, Hissar and others

...Respondents

CORAM:HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RITU BAHRI

Present: Mr. H.S.Ghuman, Advocate for the petitioner.

\*\*\*

**Ritu Bahri, J. (Oral).**

The petitioner is seeking implementation of the order dated 26.04.1991 (Annexure P-8) vide which the penalty of compulsory retirement imposed on the petitioner is ordered to be set aside from the date of imposition and he should be treated as in continuous service for all intents and purposes. He further submits that the matter be investigated separately as to how Mr. C.L. Gupta was appointed as Principal?

The petitioner had preferred revision petition which was rejected on 13.08.1984 (Annexure P-3). Thereafter he approached Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi to challenge the order dated 16.02.1993 and his appeal was dismissed on 28.05.1996 (Annexure P-11). Against this order, he filed CWP-9409-1997 which was withdrawn to enable the petitioner to approach the Civil Court for appropriate relief and this order was passed on 08.07.1997 (Annexure P-12). The petitioner then filed civil suit and vide judgment dated 24.01.2001 (Annexure P-13) it was dismissed on the ground of limitation. Thereafter the appeal was also dismissed vide order dated 12.01.2002 (Anenxure P-14) on the ground of

delay and thereafter revision was also filed. Keeping in view that appeal had been dismissed on the ground of delay, revision was also dismissed vide order dated 10.10.2002 (Annexure P-15) and even the SLP (Civil) 21512-2006 against the said order was dismissed as withdrawn in limine on 15.12.2006 (Annexure P-16). Now the petitioner has again come up here to get the order dated 26.04.1991 (Annexure P-8) implemented.

This writ petition is being dismissed on two accounts (1) the initial petition was dismissed on 08.07.1997 (Annexure P-12) and (2) the order dated 26.04.1991 is being challenged after a gap of 20 years. Moreover, he has already availed his remedy before the CAT and Civil Court and proceedings have attained finality upto the Supreme Court.

No second writ petition is maintainable.

Dismissed.

**(RITU BAHRI)**  
**JUDGE**

**15.12.2018**

**Divyanshi**

**Whether speaking/reasoned**

**:**

**Yes/No**

**Whether reportable**

**:**

**Yes/No**