

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(233)

CWP-11001-2018

Date of decision: - 20.02.2023

Narinder Singh and another

....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present:- Ms. Gurkanwal Kaur, Advocate
for Mr. Deepak Arora, Advocate, for the petitioners.

Mr. Rohit Ahuja, DAG, Punjab, for respondents No.1 to 3.

Mr. Vipin Mahajan, Advocate, for respondent No.4.

Mr. Devender Kumar, Advocate, for respondent No.5.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

This writ petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus thereby directing the official respondents to take appropriate action against respondents No.4 and 5 pertaining to various sorts of illegalities, malpractices, irregularities committed by said respondent Nos.4 and 5.

Learned State counsel, on instructions from Mr. Harpreet Singh, BDPO, sub-tehsil, Kahnuwan, District Gurdaspur, has submitted that in the said matter, an inquiry has been conducted by the then BDPO and vide an inquiry report dated 10.08.2020, the allegations made by the petitioners have not been substantiated, except with respect to the death of Piar Kaur, who was given the old age pension. It is further submitted that even with respect to the said Piar Kaur, a letter was written to the District Social Security Officer, Gurdaspur, to verify as to whether the

pension has been disbursed for the months of July, 2012 to December, 2012, after 19.07.2012, which is the date of death as provided by the petitioner with respect to the said Piar Kaur. It is also submitted that the District Social Security Officer, Gurdaspur has written a letter dated 14.07.2020 that the APRs of the pension disbursed for the months of July, 2012 to December, 2012 are not available because the record upto December, 2012 has been weeded out.

Learned State counsel as well as learned counsel for the private respondents have submitted that regarding the other allegations, nothing has been proved and since the prayer has been made in the present writ petition for taking action after due enquiry and the said enquiry has already been concluded as stated hereinabove, thus, the present writ petition has been rendered infructuous.

Copy of the inquiry report dated 10.08.2020 as well as the letter dated 14.07.2020, produced by the learned State counsel, are taken on record and have been marked as “Mark A” and “Mark B”.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that in view of stand taken by learned State counsel and the private respondents in the above-said documents, the present writ petition has been rendered infructuous and the same may be disposed of as such.

Keeping in view the above-said facts and circumstances, the present writ petition is disposed of, as having been rendered infructuous.

February 20, 2023
naresh.k

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No