

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

CWP-1103-1993 (O&M)
Date of decision : 07.05.2022

Vas Dev Goyal

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU

Present: None for the petitioner.

Ms. Maloo Chahal, DAG, Punjab.

MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU, J.

Present writ petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution, *inter alia*, for quashing the impugned order dated 19.12.1992 (P-11), whereby, petitioner was ordered to be prematurely retired.

Learned State counsel has pointed out that in compliance of order dated 10.07.2014, additional affidavit dated 09.02.2015 has already been filed and para 2 of the same reads as under:-

“2. That in respect of the above observation of this Hon'ble Court, it is made clear that as per official record, both decisions were taken by the competent authority simultaneously on dated 19.12.1992, first representation of the petitioner dated 19.11.1984 against the adverse remarks, which was conveyed to him in the Annual Confidential Report for the year 1983-84 was rejected and secondly, retirement from service. But, letter in respect of rejecting the representation against adverse remarks was issued by the Punjab Govt., Department of Agriculture (Agriculture-4

Branch) vide letter No.23/31/89/Agri.4 (2)/15174 dated 24.12.1992 (Annexure P-9) and orders of premature retirement from service were issued by Punjab Govt., Department of Agriculture (Agriculture-4 Branch) vide Endorsement No.23/31/89/Agri.4 (2)/210 dated 6.1.1993. So as per position explained above, it makes clear that the impugned order dated 19.12.1992 (Annexure P-11) was not passed during the pendency of representation of the petitioner against the adverse remarks which came to be decided vide letter dated 24.12.1992 (Annexure P-9).”

On 02.04.2022, none appeared in this case on behalf of petitioner and matter was posted for 07.05.2022.

Today again, case called twice but no one has come forward on behalf of petitioner.

In view of the above, it seems that petitioner has lost interest in the matter. As a result thereof, there is no option except to dismiss the petition for non-prosecution.

Ordered accordingly.

07.05.2022
atulsethi

(MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU)
JUDGE

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