



CWP-8313-2016

-1-

**207-3 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CWP-8313-2016

Date of Decision: 24.07.2025

Vijay Kumar

...Petitioner

Vs.

CHD Housing Board & Ors.

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. Rajinder Kumar Singla, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. Parveen Chauhan, Advocate for

Mr. Gagandeep Singh Wasu, Advocate

For respondent-Chandigarh Housing Board

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking setting aside of notice dated 31.03.2016 whereby he has been ordered to retire at the age of 46 years.

2. While issuing notice of motion on 06.06.2016, this Court ordered to maintain the *status quo*. The said order reads as under:-

“Learned counsel for the respondents has filed reply on behalf of the respondents along with Annexure R-1 to R-5 including Power of Attorney on behalf of the respondents in Court today which are taken on record.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that though the petitioner has been served with a show cause notice, but the same has the bearing of a final order retiring the petitioner from service on 30.06.2016.

Adjourned to 27.06.2016.



CWP-8313-2016

-2-

Meanwhile, status quo with regard to service of the petitioner shall be maintained.

It is, however, made clear that in case on the adjourned date, the matter is not argued, interim relief granted in the case shall be vacated.

To be heard alongwith CWP-8311-2016.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in service in view of interim orders passed by this Court. He has been further promoted in 2022. He is going to retire in 2029. Nothing adverse was recorded against him during last 9 years. He was ordered to retire only on account that he was busy in inventing some device and for writing letters to Prime Minister and President using official pad of the organization.

4. On being asked, learned counsel for respondent expressed his inability to dispute aforesaid facts. He also failed to point out any adverse entry in the ACR of the petitioner during last 9 years. He rather confirmed that petitioner has been promoted in 2022.

5. This Court in view of the aforesaid facts finds it appropriate to make absolute order dated 06.06.2016.

6. This order would not inhibit the respondent from passing fresh order, if any adverse material is found against the petitioner.

7. Disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

24.07.2025

Deepak DPA

Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No