

210

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Date of decision: 20.03.2024

(I) CWP-6089-1997

BADLU RAM

...Petitioner

VERSUS

HARYANA STATE ELECTRICITY BOARD AND OTHERS

...Respondents

(II) CWP-9213-1997

SHER SINGH

...Petitioner

VERSUS

HARYANA STATE ELECTRICITY BOARD AND ANOTHER

...Respondents

(III) CWP-6617-1997

RATTAN LAL

...Petitioner

VERSUS

HARYANA STATE ELECTRICITY BOARD AND OTHERS

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI

Present:- Mr. Shrenik Jain, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Jagbir Malik, Advocate for respondent No.1.

JASGURPREET SINGH PURI, J. (Oral)

1. Mr. Shrenik Jain, Advocate has caused appearance on behalf of the petitioner(s) and submitted that Mr. Hari Chand Rahi, earlier counsel representing the petitioner(s) has already passed away and he has no instructions from the petitioner(s) in the present cases.

2. On the other hand, Mr. Jagbir Malik, learned counsel for respondent No.1 submitted that the prayer in the present cases is for quashing the promotion order of the private respondents, whereas now with the efflux of time, the petitioners in all the cases and private respondents have already retired since the present petitions are of the year 1997. He further submitted that in CWP-6089-1997, reversion of the petitioner was stayed by this Court on 06.05.1997 and it was directed that in case the petitioner is reverted, then he shall be put back on the same post from which he was reverted. He further submitted that in CWP-9213-1997 also vide order dated 11.11.1997, the operation of the order Annexure P-10, whereby the petitioner had been reverted was stayed till further orders and same was the position in CWP-6617-1997, in which vide order dated 14.05.1997, the operation of order Annexure P-11 was stayed till further orders. He further submitted that even the instructions were also challenged. He also submitted that since all the petitioners and the private respondents have already retired and there was interim orders in all the aforesaid three writ petitions, nothing would survive in the present petitions as of now with the efflux of time.

3. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, all the three writ petitions are dismissed.

4. However, in case any cause of action still survives, then the petitioner(s) shall be at liberty to move an appropriate application for revival of the writ petitions.

20.03.2024
Chetan Thakur

(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)
JUDGE

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