

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

107

**(I) CWP-6619-2014 (O&M)
Date of Decision : October 31, 2025**

BALJEET SINGH AND ORS.

-PETITIONERS

V/S

PUNJAB AND HARYANA HIGH COURT, CHANDIGARH

-RESPONDENT

(II) CWP-32038-2018

PARKASH CHANDER AND ORS.

-PETITIONERS

V/S

**PUNJAB AND HARYANA HIGH COURT, SECTOR-1,
CHANDIGARH AND ORS.**

-RESPONDENTS

(III) CWP-20092-2015 (O&M)

SOMNATH KANOUIA

-PETITIONER

V/S

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS.

-RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. Manjeet Singh, Advocate, with
Mr. Suresh Nain, Advocate
for the petitioners (in CWP-6619-2014).

Ms. Sukhmani Patwalia, Advocate
for the petitioners (in CWP-32038-2018).

Mr. Sachin Kalia, Advocate for
Mr. R.S. Bajaj, Advocate
for the petitioner (in CWP-20092-2015).

Mr. Jasbir Singh Mor, Advocate
for the applicant/proposed intervenor (in CWP-6619-2014).

Mr. Gaurav Chopra, Senior Advocate, with
Mr. Ranjit S. Kalra, Advocate,
Ms. Gauri C. Kaushal, Advocate, and

Ms. Mona Yadav, Advocate,
for the respondent(s)-High Court.

Mr. J.S. Cooner, Advocate for
Mr. Swaran Sandhi, Advocate
for respondents No.2 and 3 (in CWP-20092-2015).

Dr. Parveen Hans, Senior Panel Counsel
for the respondent-Union of India (in CWP-32038-2018).

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (ORAL)

1. During the course of hearing on 19.09.2025, it transpired that the decision dated 01.09.2021, rendered by the Committee concerned, also needs to be challenged.

2. One of the present writ petitions, i.e. CWP No. 6619 of 2014, was earlier allowed by a Coordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 06.12.2016. However, a review application was filed, which was allowed vide order dated 17.02.2018, and the writ petition was directed to be listed for a fresh hearing. During the pendency of the writ petition, which was filed way back in 2014, a number of civil miscellaneous applications, including an application for intervention, were filed and entertained by this Court.

3. Considering the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case at hand, as also the supervening events, it would be in the interest of the petitioner(s) to file fresh writ petition(s) on the same cause of action, but with better particulars and grounds arising from the supervening events.

4. In view of the above, learned counsel for the petitioner(s) seek leave to withdraw these writ petitions, however, with liberty to file fresh writ petition(s) on the same cause of action, with better particulars, including incorporation of the prayer(s) relevant for redressal of their

grievances.

5. Consequently, these writ petitions are **dismissed as withdrawn**, however, with liberty (*supra*).
6. Pending applications stand disposed of accordingly.
7. A photocopy of this order be placed on file of each connected case.

October 31, 2025

devinder

(KULDEEP TIWARI)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Whether Reportable

:

:

Yes/No

Yes/No