

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

**CWP-5130-2018**

**Date of decision: - 16.05.2019**

**Dalip Singh**

**....Petitioner**

**Versus**

**The State of Haryana and others**

**.....Respondents**

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI**

Present:- Mr. Aditya Yadav, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.

Ms. Nidhi Garg, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana.

Ms. Navjot Kaur, Advocate  
for Mr. Vishal Gupta, Advocate  
for respondents No.2 and 4.

Mr. Munish Garg, Advocate  
for Mr. Vishal Yadav, Advocate  
for respondent No.3.

**\*\*\*\***

**HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J. (ORAL)**

In the present writ petition, the challenge is to the orders (Annexure P-5 and P-6) by which respondents No.3 and 4 were appointed on contract basis for a period of one year.

Reply has been filed on behalf of respondents No.2 and 4, today in the Court and the same is taken on record. A copy thereof has been supplied to opposite counsel.

Counsel for respondent No.3 states that period of one year has already been expired and respondent No.3 is no longer in service.

Counsel for respondents No.2 and 4 pleads ignorance about the continuance of respondent No.4 in service after an expiry of one year.

As the appointments were only for a period of one year and there is nothing on record to show that respondents No.3 and 4 have been granted extension, therefore, present writ petition has been rendered infructuous due to flux of time and the same is hereby disposed of as such.

In case the petitioner has any grievance in any appointments which might be made henceforth, he is free to avail his appropriate remedy in respect of those appointments.

( HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI )  
JUDGE

May 16, 2019  
naresh.k

|                            |     |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Whether reasoned/speaking? | Yes |
| Whether reportable?        | No  |