

**LPA no.1629 of 2017 (O&M)
and connected cases**

1

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

1. LPA no.1629 of 2017 (O&M)

DHBVNL and others

....Appellant(s)

Versus

Sanjay Kumar

...Respondent(s)

2. LPA no.1630 of 2017 (O&M)

DHBVNL and others

....Appellant(s)

Versus

Manoj Kumar

...Respondent(s)

3. LPA no.1631 of 2017 (O&M)

DHBVNL and others

....Appellant(s)

Versus

Anand Parkash

...Respondent(s)

Date of Decision : 30.01.2019

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE MAHESH GROVER
HON'BLE MR JUSTICE LALIT BATRA**

Present : Mr.G.S.Wasu, Advocate for the appellants

MAHESH GROVER, J.(ORAL)

By this order we will dispose of three Letters Patent Appeals

bearing LPA Nos. 1629, 1630 and 1631 of 2017.

Learned counsel for the appellants contends that in the impugned judgment it has been noticed that the counsel for the respondent in the writ proceedings had accepted a fact of benefit, granted to persons similarly appointed in 1992 to be correct, although the situation was to the contrary as the benefit referred to as having been granted to similarly appointed persons in 1992 was withdrawn. It is argued that State counsel had erred in saying so. Eventually this formed the reasoning by the learned Single Judge in the impugned order.

After hearing learned counsel for the appellants, we are of the opinion that if the learned counsel for the appellants pleads an erroneous projection of a fact then he should first approach the learned Single Judge in the this regard.

Hence, instant petitions are disposed of with liberty to the appellants to approach the learned Single Judge.

**(Mahesh Grover)
Judge**

30.01.2019
rekha

**(Lalit Batra)
Judge**

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No