



RSA-654-1998

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(203)

RSA-654-1998

Date of Decision: - 22.09.2025

Food Corporation of India and others

....Appellants

Versus

Rakesh Rani and others

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present:- Mr. Anurag Jain, Advocate,
Ms. Smiksha Hans, Advocate,
Ms. Namisha Kapoor, Advocate, and
Ms. Chahat, Advocate,
for the appellants.

None for the respondents.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. Respondent No.1-plaintiff had filed the suit for declaration to the effect that promotion of defendant Nos.4 to 8 ordered by defendant No.2 vide order dated 12.12.1989 was null and void and that the plaintiff was entitled to be considered for promotion of Steno Grade-II with effect from the date when defendant Nos.4 to 8 have been promoted as such. A prayer for mandatory injunction was also sought. The suit was filed in the year 1990. The trial Court had dismissed the suit however in appeal, the 1st Appellate Court had reversed the said judgment and decree and decreed the suit of respondent No.1-plaintiff and had directed the present

**RSA-654-1998****-2-**

appellants to consider the case of the appellant therein for her promotion subject to availability of the vacancies.

2. A perusal of the paper-book would show that on 24.03.1998, the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court while issuing notice of motion was also pleased to stay the operation of the impugned judgment and decree of the 1st Appellate Court. On 03.12.1998, when the matter was admitted, the interim order was ordered to be continued and the same has not been vacated till date. None had appeared on behalf of the respondents on 15.01.2024 and even on 27.05.2024, only the State counsel had appeared and no one had appeared on behalf of the respondents. Respondents No.2 to 6 are stated to have been proceeded against ex-parte vide orders dated 07.07.1998 and dated 26.07.2017.

3. Keeping in view the above-said facts and circumstances, the present appeal is disposed of. Liberty is granted to the appellants to revive the same in case respondent No.1 files execution or approaches the office of the appellants seeking enforcement of the judgment and decree of the 1st Appellate Court. Liberty is also granted to the respondents to revive the case in case any cause survives.

September 22, 2025
naresh.k

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No