



RSA-582-1994

1

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

RSA-582-1994

Date of decision : 19.02.2025

The State of Punjab and another

... Appellants

Versus

Sadajeet Singh Bhatti

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr.S.S. Hira, DAG, Punjab,
for the appellants.

Mr.G.S. Bal, Senior Advocate with
Ms. Lovepreet Kaur, Advocate
for the respondent.

VIKAS BAHL, J.(ORAL)

1. In the present case, the respondent-plaintiff had filed a suit in the year 1990 for declaration to the effect that the termination of his services w.e.f. 07.03.1977 as per order dated 04.03.1977 passed by the Excise and Taxation Commissioner, Punjab at Patiala and the order dated 02.01.1980 issued by the Under Secretary, Excise and Taxation Punjab, Chandigarh, whereby the representation of the plaintiff was rejected were illegal, null and void. The trial Court vide judgment and decree dated 20.06.1992 had decreed the suit of the plaintiff. The appeal filed by the petitioners-defendants was dismissed on 21.07.1993. On 14.07.1994, the matter was admitted and the operation of the impugned order was ordered to



RSA-582-1994

2

be stayed till further orders. The order dated 14.07.1994 is reproduced hereinbelow:-

*“Mr. D.S. Dhillon, DAG Punjab
Mr.G.S. Bal, Advocate, for the respondent*

...

Admitted. To be heard within three years.

Operation of the impugned order shall remain stayed till further orders.

14.7.1994”

2. Learned senior counsel for the respondent has submitted that as per his instructions, the respondent has died and in spite of best efforts, he has not been able to get in touch with the LRs of the respondent, nor any LR has approached his office.

3. Learned counsel for the appellants has submitted that in the said circumstances, the present appeal be disposed of but with liberty to the appellants to revive the appeal in case, the LRs of the respondent seek any benefit from the impugned judgment.

4. Keeping in view the abovesaid facts and circumstances, the present appeal is disposed of and liberty is granted to the appellants to revive the appeal in case the LRs of the respondent seek benefit of the impugned judgment.

**(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE**

February 19, 2025.

Davinder Kumar

Whether speaking / reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No