(240-2 case) IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.16688 of 2017
Date of decision: 19.07.2019

Ekta and others .... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others .... Respondents

Before: Hon'ble Mr. Justice B.S. Walia.

Present: None for the petitioners.
Mr. Saurav Mohunta, DAG, Haryana.

***

B.S. Walia, J. (Oral)

[1] Learned DAG states that petitioner Nos.1 and 3 are continuing in service as regularly selected candidates had not joined whereas petitioner No.2 stands relieved on account of regularly selected candidates joining.

[2] Faced with the aforementioned situation, learned counsel for the petitioners states that in view of the statement of learned DAG, he does not press the present writ petition qua petitioner Nos.1 and 3 whereas qua petitioner No.2, the writ petition has become infructuous and the same be disposed of as such.

[3] In the light of position as noted above, the writ petition is dismissed as not pressed qua petitioner Nos.1 and 3 while it is dismissed as having become infructuous qua petitioner No.2.

(B.S. Walia)
Judge

19.07.2019
amit

1. Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No.
2. Whether reportable : Yes/No.

AMIT KHANCHI
2019.07.23 17:40
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document