

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

Sr. No.546

**CWP-11828-1999 (O&M)
Date of decision: May 17, 2022**

Bhanwar 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 give 20th increment as due from 01.04.1991 to the petitioner and fix his salary accordingly and to cross efficiency bar of the petitioner w.e.f. 01.04.1991.

2. Petition was admitted on 16.10.2001.

3. When called out for hearing, there is no representation on behalf of the petitioner. It seems that by sheer effluxion of time and pendency of the writ petition for more than 22 years before this Court, it has been rendered infructuous and/or the petitioner seems to have lost interest in pursuing the same.

4. In any case, it appears that even on merits, grievance of the petitioner has been redressed in view of the following stand taken in para No.3 of the written statement, which is reproduced herein for ready reference:

“3. That regarding Para No.3 of the writ petition, it is submitted that the pay of petitioner is fixed by the Department as below:-

<u>Date</u>	<u>In the pay scale of Rs.1400-2600</u>
1.1.91	2360/- Ist additional increment.
1.4.91	2420/- Annual increment (4.9(A).
1.5.91	2480/- 2 nd additional increment.
1.4.92	2540/- Annual increment (4.9(A).
1.6.92	2540/- Pay fixed in the revised scale of Rs.1640-2900.
1.4.93	2600/- Annual increment (4.9(A).
1.4.94	Efficiency bar to be crossed.

However, it is also submitted that there were so many complaints against the petitioner and he was also charge-sheeted under rule 7 of Punjab and Haryana (Punishment & Appeal) Rules, 1987. After deciding complaints against petitioner the Department has crossed his efficiency bar vide letter No.9475/E-II dated 13.7.99 (copy enclosed) and the petitioner is paid all dues which were pending.”

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 disposed of as having been rendered infructuous

7. Since the main case has been decided, pending civil miscellaneous application, if any, also stands disposed of.

(ARUN MONGA)
JUDGE

May 17, 2022
ashish

Whether speaking/reasoned:
Whether reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No