



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

208

CWP-17562-2000 (O&M)
Date of decision: 07.07.2025

Manmohan Singh Luthra ...Petitioner
Versus
State of Punjab and others ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : None for the petitioner.
Mr. Satnam Preet Singh Chauhan, DAG, Punjab.
Mr. Subhash Ahuja, Advocate for respondent Nos.3 and 4.

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer made in the present petition for quashing the orders dated 07.12.2000, whereby respondent Nos.3 and 4 had promoted as District Transport Officer, might not, due to efflux of time, even be surviving.
2. Learned State counsel refers to the para 14 of the written statement dated 16.07.2001 filed on behalf of respondent Nos.1 and 2, wherein denying the averments made on the corresponding para of the writ petition that petitioner was not senior amongst the persons who were considered and at that time did not complete 12 years of service as on 19.04.2006 for promotion to the post of District Transport Officer.
3. To the aforesaid facts, there was no rebuttal made by filing any replication.
4. Even otherwise as per office report, learned counsel for the petitioner has been informed through email, however, none has appeared on his behalf.
5. Disposed of, reserving the petitioner with a liberty to get it revived, by demonstrating that the *lis* still survives.

**(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE**

07.07.2025
Hemant

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