

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

CWP-8984-2019

Date of decision : 06.02.2023

Rakesh Kumar Sharma

..... Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab and others

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present: Mr. Vishal Goel, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ankush Singla, Advocate
for respondent No.1.

Mr. Sehajbir S. Aulakh, AAG, Punjab.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (Oral)

Present writ petition has been filed seeking writ in the nature of mandamus for issuance of directions to respondent No.1 to invite fresh applications for the post of Administrative Officer in the Office of Advisory Committee, Mandir Shri Kali Devi ji/Mandir Shri Rajeshwari Ji, Patiala.

2. Whole of the claim of the petitioner was based on the fact that appointment of respondent No.5 as Administrative Officer was not in consonance with the rules as he was not a graduate.

3. Counsel for respondent No.1 at the outset submits that respondent No.5 resigned from the office of Advisory Committee and thereafter fresh appointments have been made. Neither any challenge has been made to those appointments nor the person in office is party to the present writ petition.

4. Faced with the situation, counsel for the petitioner submits that by way of present writ petition he claims writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to invite fresh applications and thus fresh appointment will not have any adverse effect on the prayer made in the writ petition.

5. I have heard counsel for the parties and have gone through the records of the case.

6. Admittedly, after the petitioner sought mandamus by way of present writ petition, appointments have been made. The person in office is not a party to the present writ petition nor there is any challenge to his appointment. Resultantly, no relief as claimed in the writ petition can be granted.

7. Consequently, the present writ petition is dismissed.

(PANKAJ JAIN)
JUDGE

06.02.2023

Dinesh

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether Reportable : No