



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP No.3897 of 1998 (O&M)
Date of decision: 31.07.2024

Hardev Singh
.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others
.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAMIT KUMAR

Present: None for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajesh Sehgal, Addl. A.G., Punjab
for respondents No.1, 2 and 4.

Mr. M.S. Sachdev, Advocate for respondent No.3.

NAMIT KUMAR J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, seeking a writ of mandamus, directing the respondents to consider the claim of the petitioner for promotion as Headmaster w.e.f. the date the person junior to him i.e. respondent No.5, was promoted as Headmistress with, all consequential benefits. Further a writ of certiorari has been sought for quashing the promotion of respondent No.5 as Headmistress.

On 18.03.1998, the following order was passed:-

“The relief asked for in the present petition stems from an order passed by the School Tribunal which in turn is the subject matter of a writ petition bearing No.8085 of 1996 at the instance of respondent-management. It will be in the fitness of things if this petition is also listed for hearing and disposed of alongwith abovesaid writ petition. So ordered.”



Vide order dated 10.05.2023, CWP No.8085 of 1996, titled as “Public High School Panshta Narur vs The Presiding Officer, The School Tribunal, Punjab, Chandigarh and others”, has been disposed of in the following terms:-

“Learned senior counsel at the outset very fairly concedes that Hardev Singh Parmar remained in service and has retired therefrom after attaining age of superannuation w.e.f. 31.01.2003 and is getting pension as well.

2. In view of above, since the parties have reconciled to the situation and Hardev Singh Parmar already stands retired about 20 years back, no issue survives for adjudication in the present writ petitioner and the same is ordered to be dismissed as having been rendered infructuous.

3. Since the main case has been decided, pending miscellaneous application, if any, shall also stands disposed off.”

Accordingly, in view of the order dated 10.05.2023 passed in CWP No.8085 of 1996, nothing survives in the present petition and the same is disposed of. However, liberty is granted to the petitioner to revive the present petition in case any cause still survives.

(NAMIT KUMAR)
JUDGE

31.07.2024

yakub

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes/No

Whether reportable:

Yes/No