

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARAYANA AT CHANDIGARH

103

**CM-15986-CWP-2019&
CM-15987-CWP-2019
& RA-CW-300-2018
IN CWP-2800-2018**

Date of decision: 07.11.2019

ZILE SINGH

...PETITIONER

VS.

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

..RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH

Present: Mr. Vikas Malik, Advocate,
for the applicant-respondent No. 5.

AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH, J. (ORAL)

CM-15986-CWP-2019

Prayer in this application is for condonation of delay of 9 days in filing the application for restoration of the review application.

For the reasons mentioned in the application, which is duly supported by the affidavit of the counsel for the applicant, the present application is allowed. Delay of 9 days in filing the application for restoration of the review application stands condoned.

CM-15987-CWP-2019

Prayer in this application is for restoration of the review application which was dismissed for non-prosecution vide order dated 09.09.2019 as the counsel for the review applicant-respondent No. 5 had not appeared in the Court.

The reasons have been assigned in the application which is

duly supported by the affidavit of the counsel himself. The explanation given by the counsel for the applicant-respondent No. 5 is accepted.

The present application is allowed and the review application is restored to its original number.

RA-CW-300-2018

Prayer in this review application is for review of the order dated 01.08.2018 on the plea that the writ petition itself was not maintainable on the ground that the Sugar Mill-respondent No. 5 would not fall within the definition of State. He, therefore, asserts that the order dated 01.08.2018 passed by this Court deserves to be reviewed and the writ petition dismissed as not maintainable.

I have considered the submissions made by the learned counsel for the applicant-respondent No. 5 but do not find myself in agreement with the contention as has been raised by the counsel for the applicant as such an objection was not raised before this Court at the time of hearing of the case nor were there any pleadings to this effect in the written statement which has been filed. The order, which had been passed, was in the presence of the counsel for respondent No. 5. This Court does not find any ground for review of the order dated 01.08.2018 passed by this Court.

In view of the above, the present application stands dismissed.

November 07, 2019

pj

**(AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable : Yes/No