

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana, at Chandigarh**Regular Second Appeal No. 1875 of 1993****Date of Decision: 28.11.2023**

Amar Nath Modi

... Appellant(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and Others

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kshetarpal.

Present: None for the appellant.

Mr. Vikas Arora, Assistant Advocate General,
Punjab, for the respondents.**Anil Kshetarpal, J.**

1. This appeal has come up for hearing after a period of 30 years. As per the office report, the name of the learned counsel representing the appellant does not exist in the directory issued by the Bar Association.
2. The learned counsel representing the respondents submits that the matter in issue is covered against the appellant in view of the following judgments:-

1. ***Krishan Lal Aggarwal v. State of Punjab 1995 (1) SCT 382***; And

2. ***Jagdish Rai Garg v. State of Punjab 1997 (2) SCT 738***.

3. The learned counsel further submits that the appellant prays for the grant of decree of declaration that he is liable to be superannuated at the age of 62 years because he was originally employed in the PEPSU State.

Whereas, the Division Bench held that after merger of the State of Punjab,

Regular Second Appeal No. 1875 of 1993

the rules of Punjab will be applicable, therefore, the employee would retire as per the rules followed by the Punjab State.

4. The appellant is not present. Hence, the present appeal is dismissed for non-prosecution.

(Anil Kshetarpal)
Judge

November 28, 2023
“DK”

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