

111

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CM-15677-CWP-2023 in/and
CWP-5126-2020 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 19.09.2023

Anil Kumar and others
Vs.
State of Punjab and others

. . . . Petitioners
. . . . Respondents

CORAM: HON’BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA

Present: Mr. Abhishek Sanghi, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. Charanpreet Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Mrs. Manveen Kahlon, Advocate
for respondents No.5 to 8, 11 to 13.

Mr. Anureet S. Sidhu, Advocate
for respondents No. 17 to 25, 41, 42, 45 to 50, 52 to 55,
59 to 62, 64 to 71.

SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA, J.(Oral)

1. Application no.CM-15677-CWP-2023 has been filed by the counsel for the petitioners stating that the orders which were impugned by them in the present writ petition were withdrawn vide order dated 24.08.2022. The said order of withdrawal was challenged by the promoted respondents in writ petition no.CWP-20697-2022 wherein an interim order was passed protecting them.
2. Learned counsel submits that one of the petitioners is due to retire in the year 2024, and therefore directions be issued to conduct a

time-bound review of the CAS promotions as per Rules laid down in AICTE.

3. This Court finds that the petitioners challenged the orders of promotion granted to the respondents and the result of the CAS. The said orders have already been withdrawn by the respondents vide order dated 24.08.2022.
4. Keeping in view thereto, the writ petition filed by the petitioners has been rendered infructuous as no possible orders can be passed in favour of the petitioners, after the orders impugned have already been withdrawn.
5. The petitioners' contention of there being a separate writ petition filed by the concerned promotees, whose promotion orders had been withdrawn, is a separate cause of action altogether, and cannot be adjudicated or examined in the present writ petition.
6. The petitioners would always be free to move appropriate applications for intervening/impleadment of parties in the said writ petition where they can take up all their contentions in support of the orders passed by the Government.
7. However, in the present case, no possible orders can be passed in favour of the petitioner.
8. Writ Petition in view of above observations stands ***dismissed*** as having been rendered infructuous with liberty as above.
9. Further, the prayer made in the application for reviewing the promotions is also misconceived as the issue is alive in the other writ petition before this Court.

- 10.In view thereof, CM is misconceived and is dismissed.
- 11.Pending application(s), if any, also stands disposed of accordingly.

(SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA)
JUDGE

September 19, 2023
Mohit goyal

- | | |
|-------------------------------|--------|
| 1. Whether speaking/reasoned? | Yes/No |
| 2. Whether reportable? | Yes/No |