



367

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

CWP-12595-2006 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 24.02.2026

Sumanjeet Walia

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and Others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. Pawan Kumar, Senior Advocate with
Ms. Charanjeet Kaur, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Arun Jindal, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking writ of prohibition directing the respondents not to keep post of Establishment Officer reserved for respondent No.4 (scheduled caste candidate).

2. On 11.08.2006 while issuing notice of motion, the following order was passed:

“Notice of motion to the respondents.

On the asking of Court, Shri Ashok Aggarwal, Additional Advocate General, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the respondents No.1 to 3.

Copies of the writ petition have been supplied to the learned counsel for the respondents.

Notice dasti only qua respondent No.4.

Adjourned to November 23, 2006.

We, however, make it clear that any promotion to the post of Establishment Officer shall abide by the final decision of the writ petition.”

3. On 19.03.2008, the writ petition was admitted and authorities were directed to maintain *status quo*.
4. Learned State counsel submits that petitioner as well as respondent No.4 have retired on attaining the age of superannuation, thus, petition has rendered infructuous.
5. Learned counsel representing the petitioner does not dispute the aforesaid fact.
6. In the wake of statements of both sides, the petition stands ***disposed of***.
7. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

24.02.2026
Prince Chawla

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