

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

(212)

CWP No. 18549 of 2017

Date of Decision : 16.11.2022

Balwinder Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: None for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajesh Gaur, Additional Advocate General, Haryana.

Mr. Maheshinder Singh Sidhu, Advocate
for respondents No. 2, 4, 5 and 6.

Harsimran Singh Sethi J. (Oral)

No one appears on behalf of the petitioner to press the present petition.

Learned counsel for the respondents submits that it is the petitioner, who did not report for the duty in the office of District Project Co-ordinator, Kaithal after the transfer hence, the claim of the petitioner that despite not on duty, he should be paid, is liable to be rejected as he never worked for the period in question.

As no one appears on behalf of the petitioner, it can be safely presumed that petitioner is not interested in pursuing the present petition.

Dismissed for non-prosecution.

November 16, 2022

kanchan

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : No