

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS
CIVIL APPEAL NO(s). 552 OF 2001

STATE OF PUNJAB & ANR. Appellant (s)

VERSUS

SAMPURAN SINGH(DEAD) THROUGH LRS. Respondent(s)

(With office report)

Date: 10/11/2010 This Appeal was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B. SUDERSHAN REDDY
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURINDER SINGH NIJJAR

For Appellant(s) Mr. Kuldip Singh, Adv.
Mr. Ajay Pal, Adv.

For Respondent(s) Mr. P.C. Agrawal, Sr. Adv.
Mrs.Revathy Raghavan, Adv.
Mr. Aditya K. Dubey, Adv.

Mr. Ambuj Aggarwal, Adv.

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

The Appeal is dismissed without any order as to
costs in terms of the signed order.

(DEEPAK MANSUKHANI)
Court Master

(RENUKA SADANA)
Court Master

(The signed order is placed on the file)
IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 552 OF 2001

State of Punjab & Anr.Appellant(s)

Versus

Sampuran Singh(Dead) Through LRs.Respondent(s)

O R D E R

The Respondent (since deceased) was dismissed from his

service as Police Constable on 19.5.1972. That order of dismissal was challenged by him in a Civil Suit. The Trial Court by the decree and Judgment dated 24th January, 1986 declared the order of dismissal as illegal. The appeal preferred by State of Punjab was also dismissed. The Regular Second Appeal No. 3261 of 1986 preferred by the State of Punjab was also dismissed by the Judgment dated 30th May, 2007 by the High Court of Punjab and Haryana, Chandigarh.

The Respondent filed another suit in the year 1991 after his retirement on 30th April, 1989 claiming promotions to two posts higher up and also claiming arrears of salary relating to those posts. The suit has been decreed by the Trial Court and the First Appellate Court. The Second Appeal preferred by the State was dismissed against which the present appeal has been preferred.

-2-

That the respondent is no more and what his LRs are getting as at present is some additional financial benefits on account of his deemed promotion to two posts of higher up than the post which he was holding at the time of his retirement. In the circumstances, we are not inclined to interfere with the impugned Judgment of the High Court which confirmed the decree of the Trial Court and the Appellate Court granting of relief of promotion to the deceased respondent.

However, the questions of law are left open and the impugned Order shall not be treated as precedent in any other case.

The appeal is accordingly dismissed without any order as to costs.

.....J.

(B. Sudershan Reddy)

.....J.
(Surinder Singh Nijjar)

New Delhi
November 10, 2010.