

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-18229-2010 (O&M)
Date of decision : 20.03.2023

Court on its own motion

Versus

U.T. Administration, Chandigarh and othersRespondents

2) CWP-17530-2010 (O&M)

Court on its own motion

Versus

State of Punjab and othersRespondents

3) CWP-18390-2010 (O&M)

Court on its own motion

Versus

State of Punjab and othersRespondents

4) CWP-7500-2010 (O&M)

Court on its own motion

Versus

State of Punjab and othersRespondents

5) CWP-18947-2010 (O&M)

Court on its own motion

Versus

State of Haryana and othersRespondents

6) CWP-6790-2011 (O&M)

Court on its own motion

Versus

State of Haryana and othersRespondents

7) Yuvsatta and another	<u>CWP-10655-2020 (O&M)</u>Petitioners
Versus	
Union Territory of Chandigarh and others	Respondents
8) Kapil Khanna and others	<u>CWP-7260-2017 (O&M)</u>Petitioners
Versus	
State of Haryana and others	Respondents
9) Vijay Bansal and others	<u>CWP-14020-2011 (O&M)</u>Petitioners
Versus	
Union of India and others	Respondents
10) Viresh Shandilya	<u>CWP-6222-2010 (O&M)</u>Petitioner
Versus	
State of Haryana	Respondent
11) M/s Shape India Outdoors	<u>CWP-23005-2012 (O&M)</u>Petitioner
Versus	
Municipal Corporation, Hisar and another	Respondents
12) Skycom	<u>CWP-22490-2012 (O&M)</u>Petitioner
Versus	
State of Haryana and others	Respondents
13) M/s Sapphire Media Service	<u>CWP-23468-2012 (O&M)</u>Petitioner
Versus	
Municipal Council, Kaithal and another	Respondents

14) CWP-24263-2012 (O&M)

M/s Brand Promoters and othersPetitioners

Versus

Municipal Corporation, Rohtak and anotherRespondents

15) CWP-24292-2012 (O&M)

M/s Kusha Advertising Pvt. Ltd.Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and othersRespondents

16) CWP-278-2018 (O&M)

Babita and othersPetitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and othersRespondents

17) COCP-1157-2010 (O&M)

Jagir Singh Sandhu and anotherPetitioner

Versus

S.C. Aggarwal, Chief Secretary, State of PunjabRespondent

18) COCP-2695-2012 (O&M)

Bhupinder SinghPetitioner

Versus

Ram Niwas and othersRespondents

19) COCP-634-2013 (O&M)

Devender SinghPetitioner

Versus

Ram Niwas and othersRespondents

20)

COCP-3205-2016 (O&M)

Munish Arora

....Petitioner

Versus

Anirudh Tiwari and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAVI SHANKER JHA, CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI

Present: Mr. Atul Lakhanpal, Senior Advocate (Amicus Curiae), with
Mr. Sidharth Chawla, Advocate (in CWP-18229-2010).

Mr. Aalok Jagga, Advocate, and
Mr. S.S. Bajaj, Advocate, for the petitioner
(in COCP-3205-2016).

Mr. Suman Jain, Advocate, and
Mr. Rishabh Jain, Advocate, for M.C. Chandigarh.
Mr. Gaurav Mohunta, Additional Standing Counsel and
Ms. Yashasvi Goyal, Advocate,
for M.C. Chandigarh (in CWP-18390-2010).

Mr. Anil Mehta, Senior Standing Counsel, with
Ms. Madhu Dayal, Advocate, for the U.T. Chandigarh.

Mr. Jaivir Chandail, Additional Standing Counsel,
for U.T. Chandigarh (in CWP-7500-2010).

Mr. Deepak Balyan, Additional A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Arjun Sheoran, DAG, Punjab.

Ms. Bhavti Pujara, Advocate, for PUDA
(in CWPs-7500 and 10530-2010 & CWP-18390-2011).

Mr. Karminder Singh, Advocate, and
Mr. Prabhsher Singh Walia, Advocate,
for the respondent-Railways.

Mr. Saksham Khunger, Advocate, for
Mr. Sandeep Khunger, Advocate,
for respondent-M.C. Mohali.

Mr. Vishal, Advocate, for
Mr. Jagdish Manchanda, Advocate.

Mr. Sunil Chadha, Senior Advocate, with
Ms. Devyani Sharma, Advocate,
for respondent-M.C. Ludhiana (in COCP-3205-2016).

Ms. Brea Sandhu, Advocate, for
Ms. Deepali Puri, Advocate,
for respondent-M.C. Pathankot and Moga.

Ms. Uru Sharma, Advocate, for
Mr. Akashdeep Singh, Advocate,
for respondent No.5 (in COCP-2695-2012).

RAVI SHANKER JHA, CHIEF JUSTICE (Oral)

Learned counsel for the respondents and the petitioners (in COCP-3205-2016), as also the learned Amicus Curiae (in CWP-18229-2010), submit, in unison, that this bunch of petitions have been rendered infructuous with efflux of time, as nothing substantive survives for adjudication. Accordingly, it is urged that these cases be disposed of, as such.

In the wake of the above and as nothing to the contrary is submitted, these petitions are disposed of, as having been rendered infructuous. However, in case any cause of action/dispute/interest still survives for adjudication, the petitioners shall be at liberty to move an appropriate application in this regard.

(RAVI SHANKER JHA)
CHIEF JUSTICE

(ARUN PALLI)
JUDGE

March 20, 2023
Ak Sharma

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