

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CHANDIGARH BENCH**

QA No. 060/00729/2014

Date of decision- 14.10.2014

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. SANJEEV KAUSHIK, MEMBER (J)
HON'BLE MR. UDAY KUMAR VARMA, MEMBER (A)**

M.P. Sharma, IFS, aged 56 years S/o Sh Jagdish Chander holding the rank of Conservator of Forests, presently posted as Chief General Manager, Haryana Forest Development Corporation, Sector 4, Panchkula,

...APPLICANT

BY ADVOCATE : Sh. R.K.Sharma.

VERSUS

1. Union of India through the Secretary, Ministry of Forest & Environment, Paaryavaran Bahwan, CGO Complex, Lodhi Road, New Delhi.
2. State of Haryana through the Principal Secretary to Government of Haryana, Forest Department, Chandigarh.
3. Principal Chief Conservator of Forests, Haryana, Plot No. 18, Van Bhawan, Sector 6, Haryana, Panchkula.
4. Principal Chief Conservator of Forests-cum-Managing Director, Haryana Forest Development Corporation, Sector 4, Panchkula.

1

5. Comptroller and Auditor General of India, 9, Deendayal Upadhyay Marg, New Delhi.
6. Principal, Accountant General (Audit), Haryana, Sector 33, Chandigarh.
7. Bureau of Public Enterprises, Haryana, Sector 17, Chandigarh through its Managing Director.
8. Sh. Vivek Saxena, IFS, Officer on special Duty, Haryana Bhawan, Copernix Marg, New Delhi.
9. Sh. Paramjeet Sangwan, HFS, General Manager, Haryana Forest Development Corporation Sector 4, Panchkula.

...RESPONDENTS

BY ADVOCATE: Sh. Deepak Agnihotri, counsel for respondent no. 1,
Sh. D.S. Nalwa, counsel for respondent no. 2, 3, & 7.
Sh. D.R.Sharma, for respondent no. 4.
Sh. Barjesh Mittal, counsel for respondent no. 5 & 6.
Sh. Praveen Gupta, counsel for respondent no. 8.
None for respondent no. 9.

ORDER (ORAL)

HON'BLE MR. SANJEEV KAUSHIK, MEMBER (J):-

1. Heard.
2. Sh. D.S. Nalwa, learned counsel for respondents nos. 2, 3 & 7 argued that instant O.A has become infructuous as both the impugned orders dated 04.08.2014 (Annexure A-1) and 14.08.2014 (Annexure A-2) have been withdrawn by the respondents vide their order dated 13.10.2014. Both the orders produced in the court are taken on record. Copies,

thereof, have been handed over to the counsel for the applicant.

3. Sh. D.R. Sharma, appearing on behalf of respondent no. 4, corporation endorsed the same.
4. Sh. R.K. Sharma, appearing on behalf of the applicant too did not dispute about aforesaid factual position. However, he seeks permission to challenge the order, if need arises.
5. Considering that both the impugned orders have been withdrawn by the respondents/authorities who had issued the same, the present O.A is dismissed as having been rendered infructuous. Being independent cause of action, there is no need to grant any liberty to the applicant as he can challenge the same as per law and rules.

Uday Kumar Varma
(UDAY KUMAR VARMA)
MEMBER (A)

Sanjeev Kaushik
(SANJEEV KAUSHIK)
MEMBER (J)

Dated: 14.10.2014.

'jk'