



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

215

CWP No.13397 of 2001 (O&M)
Date of decision: 04.09.2024

Satnam Singh and another

....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAMIT KUMAR

Present: None for the petitioners.

Mr. Surya Kumar, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Aman Sharma, Advocate
for respondents No.2 and 3.

Mr. Vikas Singh, Advocate
for respondent No.9.

NAMIT KUMAR J. (Oral)

Prayer in this writ petition filed by the petitioner under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, is for issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari, quashing the order No.326/PRTC/Amla dated 29.05.2001, passed by respondent No.2 vide which respondents No.4 to 8 have been promoted to the posts of Class-III category and for quashing the order No.1318/PRTC/Amla dated 08.01.1999 passed by respondent No.2 vide which respondent No.9 has been promoted on the post of DPC (Class-III category) and for quashing the orders No.22330 dated 20.01.2000, passed by the General Manager, PRTC, Patiala (Annexures P-5 and P-6) vide which the prayer of the petitioners for

2024:PHHC:115192



promotion on the post of Class-III category was rejected. Further a writ of mandamus has been sought for directing respondents No.1 to 3 to promote the petitioners w.e.f. 08.01.1999 and grant them all the necessary consequential service benefits.

No one appeared on behalf of the petitioners on the last date of hearing i.e. 12.07.2024 and notices were ordered to be issued to the petitioners and respondents No.4 to 9.

As per office report, notices issued to the petitioners have been received back duly served and notice issued to respondent No.4 has been received back unserved with the report “not posted at the given address”; notice issued to respondent No.5 has been received back with the report “no record available”; notice issued to respondent No.6 has not been received back served or otherwise; notice issued to respondent No.7 has been received back with the report “he has been transferred to Patiala and is on Ex-India leave till 13.09.2024 and notice issued to respondent No.8 has been received back with the report “transferred to Patiala”.

Mr. Aman Sharma, Advocate, has put in appearance on behalf of respondents No.2 and 3 and Mr. Vikas Singh, Advocate has appeared on behalf of respondent No.9.

Learned counsel for respondents No.2 and 3 submits that during the pendency of the present petition, the petitioners as well as respondents No.5 to 9 have retired from service and respondent No.6 has died and respondent No.4 is still in service. He further submits that

2024:PHHC:115192



the petitioners and respondents No.5 to 9, retired from service from the post of Senior Assistant and therefore, with the efflux of time, the instant petition has been rendered infructuous.

Disposed of accordingly.

(NAMIT KUMAR)
JUDGE

04.09.2024
yakub

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