

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

CWP-11555-2000 (O&M)

Date of decision: May 24, 2022

Bhim Singh and another

.....Petitioners

versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

Present: Mr. Dinesh Ghai, Advocate and
Mr. Nikhil Ghai, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. R.D. Sharma, DAG Haryana.

ARUN MONGA, J. (ORAL)

Petitioners herein, are seeking issuance of a writ in the nature of Certiorari for partly quashing/modifying impugned orders dated 12.03.1999 (Annexure P-5), order dated 24.01.2000 (Annexure P-10) and order dated 13.03.2000 (Annexure P-15) passed by respondent No.4, whereby representation of petitioner No.1 for setting aside order dated 24.01.2000 and granting scale of Rs.6500-9000 + Rs.90/- as Special Pay was considered and filed by respondent No.4. Further a writ in the nature of Mandamus has been sought for directions to the concerned respondent to grant petitioner No.1, the pay scale of Rs.6500-9900 plus Rs.90/- as special pay (Annexure P-2) and to petitioner No.2 Rs.8000-13500 plus Special Pay of Rs.100/- (to both the petitioners), along with arrears of salary, promotion, seniority and other consequential service benefits alongwith interest.

2. Petition was admitted for hearing on 12.08.2002.

3. When taken up for final adjudication, after around 21 years, both learned counsels are unable to assist the Court for lack of instructions. Learned counsel for the petitioners states that despite attempts, his office could not contact the petitioners. In the premise, no useful purpose would be served to issue fresh notice to the petitioners as the same too would be an exercise in futile. Even the addresses of the petitioners are also perhaps not complete as is borne out from the memo of parties.

4. Whereas, learned counsel for the State also submits that he made attempts to get instructions from the office representatives of the respondents, but for lack of any assistance, he is unable to address arguments.

3. It seems that by sheer effluxion of time and pendency of the writ petition for more than 21 years before this Court, either it has been rendered infructuous or even otherwise the petitioners seem to have lost interest in pursuing the same.

4. Be that as it may, writ petition is disposed of with liberty to the petitioners to file an appropriate application in case any cause of action still survives.

(ARUN MONGA)
JUDGE

May 24, 2022
mahavir

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No