



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

204

CWP-914-2005

Date of Decision: 08.05.2025

AMARJIT SINGH

... Petitioner

VERSUS

**DY. COMMANDANT – 61 BN, CRPF, MANTRIPUKHRI
IMPHAL AND OTHERS**

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ.

Present: Mr. Mohan Singh Chauhan, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. K.J.S. Bhullar, Advocate for Mr. Akashdeep Singh, Central
Govt. Counsel for the respondent-U.O.I.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)

Challenge in the present petition is to the order of compulsory retirement of the petitioner from service.

On 16.02.2024, this Court had recorded an order after taking note of the order dated 13.02.2017 that the petitioner was compulsorily retired in 2000 and the maximum period for which he could remain in service has already passed away due to efflux of time. The Court conveyed its opinion that the petition has been rendered infructuous, whereupon counsel for the petitioner sought time to seek instructions. Accordingly, the matter was adjourned to 23.02.2024. On the said date, the lawyers had been abstaining from work and as such, the case was adjourned to 12.03.2024. On the said date, the case was once again adjourned for 31.08.2024.

On 31.08.2024, while reiterating the order dated 16.02.2024, the counsel for the petitioner was granted one last opportunity to argue the matter and accordingly, the case was adjourned to 25.09.2024. On the said case, the counsel for the petitioner prayed for some more time, which was granted subject to costs of Rs.2500/- and the case was adjourned for 21.11.2024. On the said date, the counsel for the petitioner was stated to be unavailable and, therefore, the case was adjourned for today i.e. 08.05.2025.

Today, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he has made umpteen efforts to seek instructions from the petitioner, but he is not able to establish contact with the petitioner. He thus prays for yet another opportunity to do the needful.

I am, however, of the opinion that more than one year has already elapsed since the opportunity was granted to the counsel for the petitioner to seek instructions and even thereafter two last opportunities have also been granted but the needful could not be done so far. The matter pertains to the year 2005. It seems that the petitioner may not be interested any further in pursuing the present petition.

Hence, the present petition is hereby dismissed for want of prosecution.

Liberty is, however, granted to the counsel for the petitioner to move an appropriate application for seeking revival of the present petition and adjudication thereof on merits in case he is able to get the instructions from his client within a period of four months from today.

MAY 08, 2025.

Rajender

**(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No