

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

126

CWP No.26180 of 2018 (O&M)

Date of decision: 20.06.2019

Rajinder Parshad Sharma

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present: None for the petitioner.

Mr. Gaurav Tangri, Advocate
for respondent No.4.

Mr. Munish Dev Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J. (ORAL)

Called twice, counsel for the petitioner is not present.

The petitioner who had retired on 31.03.2018 after attaining the age of superannuation was re-employed for a period of one year which has also elapsed on 22.05.2019. The petitioner filed this petition challenging impugned order, Annexure P-3, a transfer order. On 10.06.2019, counsel for the petitioner had admitted that the petitioner had been relieved but he sought adjournment on the ground to know as to whether the petitioner has been granted any fresh extension or not.

Learned State counsel, on instructions from Dharamvir, Assistant, Irrigation & Water Resources Department, Haryana, Panchkula, has submitted that no fresh extension had been granted.

Keeping in view the aforesaid fact, the present petition has

been rendered infructuous and is disposed of as such. However, the petitioner would be at liberty to move an application for revival, if fresh extension has been granted.

The pending miscellaneous application, if any, shall stand disposed of accordingly.

20.06.2019
D.Bansal

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes / No
Whether Reportable	Yes / No