

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

(102)

CWP-18201-2016

Date of decision: - 10.10.2023

Pardeep Kumar

....Petitioner

Versus

Punjab and Haryana High Court, Chandigarh and another

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present:- Ms. Anju Arora, Advocate, for the petitioner.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. Present writ petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for the issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to appoint the petitioner on the post of Clerk, with a further prayer to quash the order dated 31.05.2016 (Annexure P-12) vide which request of the petitioner has been rejected.
2. On 05.09.2016, a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court was pleased to pass the following order: -

“Ms. Arora prays for time to bring on record by way of additional affidavit all the facts regarding 25% quota, how many Peons have already been promoted as Clerks, the position of unfilled vacancies belong to which category i.e. direct recruitment or promotion and still further promotion from Process Servers and Peons as Clerks in the ratio of 1:2.

Adjourned sine die.

05.09.2016

**[RAJIV NARAIN RAINA]
JUDGE”**

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that she has not been able to contact the petitioner to get instructions for filing the additional affidavit in pursuance of the above-said order, thus, seeks to withdraw the present writ petition with liberty to file a fresh petition after complying with the above-said order dated 05.09.2016 in case any cause survives.

4. In view of the above statement of learned counsel for the petitioner, the present writ petition is dismissed as withdrawn, with the aforesaid liberty.

5. It is made clear that in case any such petition is filed by the petitioner, the same would be considered independently keeping all the points open.

October 10, 2023
naresh.k

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No