

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.14701 of 2018 (O&M)

Date of Decision.11.04.2023

Satyawan Sheoran

...Petitioner

Vs

State of Haryana and another

...Respondents

CORAM:HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present: Mr. Rajesh Arora, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Kapil Bansal, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. K.K. Gupta, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

-. -

JAISHREE THAKUR J. (ORAL)

The present writ petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus, directing respondents to promote the petitioner to the post of Assistant Secretary from the date his juniors were promoted along with consequential benefits.

Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would contend that as per the criteria laid down for promotion to the post of Assistant Secretary, there is requirement of 70% of ACRs for the last 10 years to be 'Good' or above. Petitioner's ACRs for the last 10 years are 'Good' and above, except one which is 'Average' and therefore, the petitioner fulfilled the criteria of 70% 'Good' and above ACRs and was eligible to be promoted when his juniors were promoted.

Notice of motion was issued as far back as 31.07.2018 and a reply has been filed in the meanwhile.

Learned counsel appearing for respondent No.2 today, would apprise the Court that the petitioner has submitted a letter dated 04.09.2020 to the

department to the effect that he would not like to pursue with the instant writ petition, he has been promoted as Assistant Secretary from the due date. It is also submitted that adverse remarks recorded in the ACR of the petitioner for the period 2015-2016 also stands expunged by the Appellate Authority.

Communications as furnished on behalf of respondent No.2 dated 22.02.2019, 26.02.2019, 20.10.2020 are taken on record.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner would submit that he is not apprised of the change in status and whether the petitioner has been given promotion as sought.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and in view of the communication dated 20.10.2020 along with letter of the petitioner wherein it is stated that he does not want to proceed with the matter, this writ petition is disposed of as having been rendered infructuous. However, in case, any grievance of the petitioner qua present writ petition still survives, the petitioner is at liberty to revive the same.

(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE

April 11, 2023
Pankaj*

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