

212

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-3339-1998
Date of decision: 07.03.2024

M.P. SETH

...Petitioner

VERSUS

HSEB SHAKTI BHAWAN THROUGH ITS SECY. AND ANR.

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI

Present:- Ms. Manvi Arora, Advocate for
Mr. Rakesh Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Udit Garg, Advocate
for the respondents.

JASGURPREET SINGH PURI, J. (Oral)

1. The present writ petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India seeking issuance of a writ in the nature of *certiorari* for quashing the impugned order dated 25.10.1996 (Annexure P-10), vide which an amount of Rs.1,25,000/- was ordered to be recovered from the petitioner and Annexure P-15, vide which the appeal filed by the petitioner was dismissed.

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has already died and vide order dated 06.03.1998, the operation of the impugned order was stayed by this Court. She further submitted that in case any recovery has already been effected prior to the passing of the aforesaid impugned order, the learned counsel for the petitioner

would not press with regard to the recovery already made since the petitioner himself has died and also the legal representatives have not approached the learned counsel in this regard.

3. Mr. Udit Garg, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of the respondents and has filed his memo of appearance in the Court today.

4. The present writ petition is of the year 1998. The subject matter of the present petition is for recovery of an amount of Rs.1,25,000/- from the petitioner and the operation of the impugned order was stayed by this Court on 06.03.1998. It is so stated by learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner that before the passing of the impugned order, in case any recovery was effected from the petitioner, who has already died, the same will not be pressed by the learned counsel and his legal representatives.

5. After hearing learned counsel for the parties, this Court is of the view that the only subject matter of the present petition was the impugned order (Annexure P-10), vide which an amount of Rs.1,25,000/- was ordered to be recovered from the petitioner. The petitioner has already died and therefore, the present writ petition would become redundant.

6. Consequently, the present writ petition is disposed of as having become redundant.

07.03.2024
Chetan Thakur

(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)
JUDGE

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