

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

212

CWP-19742-1998 (O&M)
Date of decision : 04.04.2024

Sukhjinder Pal SinghPetitioner

V/S

Pepsu Road Transport Corporation and anotherRespondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAMIT KUMAR

Present: Ms. Anamika Sheoran, Advocate for
Mr. Vikas Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. U.M. Khan, Advocate for
Mr. Anupam Singla, Advocate for the respondents.

NAMIT KUMAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking a writ of mandamus directing the respondents to regularize the services of the petitioner w.e.f. the date persons junior to him have been regularized.
2. The case set up by the petitioner in the petition is that he joined the services of the respondent-Corporation as a labourer in May, 1983 on daily wage basis and his services were terminated. He raised an industrial dispute which was referred to the Labour Court for adjudication. The Labour Court vide its award dated 30.03.1993 ordered reinstatement of the petitioner with continuity of service but without back wages. Against the said award, the respondent filed CWP No.7301 of 1994 before this Court. The petitioner was reinstated in service and is continuing in service since May, 1983. However, his services has not

been regularized whereas number of persons junior to him have been regularized. However, no details of the juniors have been given in the petition.

3. Learned counsel for the respondent-Corporation submits that during the pendency of the present petition, the petitioner had applied for the post of Conductor in the month of November, 2000 and he was appointed on regular basis as Conductor vide order dated 13.02.2001 w.e.f. 19.12.2000 and he unfortunately died on 07.05.2021 prior to the date of attaining the age of superannuation. His all retiral benefits along with ex-gratia grant have been paid to his wife Smt.Nachhattar Kaur, who was the nominee of the petitioner in the records of the Corporation. He submits that the instant petition has been rendered infructuous.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he is not in touch with the petitioner.

5. In this view of the matter, the present petition is disposed of as having become infructuous. However, liberty is granted to the LRs of the petitioner for revival of the present petition, if anything still survives.

04.04.2024
kothiyal

(NAMIT KUMAR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable:	Yes/No