

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

203

CWP-18829-1996
Date of decision : 22.04.2024

Gurnam Singh and othersPetitioners

V/S

State of Punjab and othersRespondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAMIT KUMAR

Present: Mr. Jugam Arora, Advocate for
Mr. R.K. Arora, Advocate for the petitioners.

Ms. Arundhati Kulshreshtha, A.A.G., Punjab.

Mr. Sanjeev Soni, Advocate with
Mr. Sarthak Soni, Advocate for respondents No.2 and 3.

NAMIT KUMAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner has filed the instant writ petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of appropriate orders/directions declaring the action of the respondent-authorities in not protecting the house rent allowance of the petitioners in the light of policy decision dated 18.12.1995 (Annexure P-5) and further not implementing the benefit of the policy decision in respect of the petitioners, as illegal. Further directions have been sought to the respondent-authorities to protect the house rent allowance of the petitioners and grant the benefit of Punjab Government Policy decision dated 18.12.1995 to the petitioners along with all consequential benefits.
2. Learned counsel for respondents No.2 and 3 submits that the reply on behalf of respondents No.2 and 3 has already been filed,

however, the same is not on record. He has placed on record a photocopy of the same. In para 17 and 23 of the said reply, it has been stated as under :-

“17. That the contents of para no.17 are denied. The respondent no. 2 has already taken a decision to implement the circular of Punjab Govt. bearing no.4/13/95/EFPI/9436 issued by the Finance Personnel-1 Branch of the State of Punjab dated 18.12.1995.

23 That the respondent no. 2 is bound to adopt the policy formulated by the State of Punjab. In view of the adoption of policy decision of State of Punjab dated 18th December, 1995, which is the main demand of the petitioner, no law point arises.”

3. Learned counsel for respondents No.2 and 3, on instructions from the department, submits that since the benefits claimed by the petitioners have already been released to them, therefore, the instant petition has been rendered infructuous.

4. Disposed of as having become infructuous.

22.04.2024

kothiyal

(NAMIT KUMAR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No