

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

**Item No.540**

**CWP No.11072 of 1999 (O&M)**

**Date of decision: 17.05.2022**

Prithvi Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Haryana and Others

...Respondents

**Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice Arun Monga**

Present : None for the petitioner.

Mr. R.D. Sharma, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

**Arun Monga, J. (Oral)**

Petition was filed in the year 1999, *inter alia*, for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to release salary of the petitioner w.e.f. 01.12.1998 to 21.07.1999, who was working as Beldar at the relevant time on daily wages.

2. Petition was admitted on 01.08.2001.

3. None appears on behalf of the petitioner. It seems that by sheer effluxion of time and pendency of the writ petition for around 22 years before this Court, either it has been rendered infructuous or even otherwise the petitioner seems to have lost interest in pursuing the same.

4. In any case, it appears that even on merits, claim of the petitioner is not admissible in view of the following stand taken in para No.4 of the written statement, which is reproduced herein for ready reference:

*“4. That in reply to Para No.4 it is submitted that the petitioner worked under the respondent No.4 total 71 days, detail of which is given below:-*

| <i>Month</i>       | <i>Days</i> | <i>Rate</i>  | <i>Amount Paid</i> |
|--------------------|-------------|--------------|--------------------|
| <i>1. Sept. 98</i> | <i>26</i>   | <i>63.12</i> | <i>1641/-</i>      |
| <i>2. Oct. 98</i>  | <i>19</i>   | <i>63.12</i> | <i>1199/-</i>      |
| <i>3. Nov. 98</i>  | <i>26</i>   | <i>63.12</i> | <i>1641/-</i>      |

*The payment for the period mentioned above already been given to the petitioner and the same has been received by him. A photocopy of the Muster Rolls is attached as Annexure R-1. Nothing is payable to the petitioner from 30.11.99 onwards as the services of the petitioner were no more required thereafter. There is no question of meeting the respondent No.4 for payment.”*

5. I am in agreement with the stand taken by the respondent-State as aforesaid. The same in any case has not been controverted either by way of replication or by way of any additional affidavit.
6. In view of the aforesaid, no ground for interference is made out. Petition is dismissed.
7. Since the main case has been decided, pending civil miscellaneous application, if any, also stands disposed of.

**May 17, 2022**  
*ashish*

**(Arun Monga)**  
**Judge**

|                           |   |        |
|---------------------------|---|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | : | Yes/No |
| Whether reportable        | : | Yes/No |