

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

CWP No.10397 of 2013

Date of decision: 18.05.2015

Satpal Inspector

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI**

Present: Mr. ID Singla, Advocate, for the petitioner.  
Mr. Pankaj Mulwani, DAG, Punjab with  
Mr. Balwinder Singh, Jr. Asst. O/o DGP Punjab.

\*\*\*

1. Whether reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest?

\*\*\*

**ARUN PALLI J.** (Oral)

Writ in the nature of certiorari is prayed for so as to quash the order dated 28.01.2013 (Annexure P6). And a mandamus is sought to the respondents to include the name of the petitioner in the seniority list of the Inspectors of Police issued on 07.06.2011. Further, a direction to the respondents to consider the claim of the petitioner for promotion to the post of Deputy Superintendent of Police with effect from the date his juniors were promoted.

Learned State counsel has produced in court a letter dated 18.05.2015, issued by the Director General of Police, Punjab (Litigation Branch), and is taken on record, which shows that in similar matters such as CWP No.6501 of 2013 and other connected cases, this court vide its order dated 16.12.2014, had observed as thus:

“The petitions are thus disposed of with a mandate to the respondents to recast the seniority of the officers by keeping in view the observations of this Court. The respondents would do well to give wide publicity to the exercise proposed to be undertaken and invite the claims and objections from all affected so as to obviate the chances of any objection on this score. While dealing with the matter, the respondents would be at liberty to take an appropriate decision in regard to the individual claims and pass speaking orders in this regard.”

And pursuant to the order that has been extracted above, the seniority of the PAP and District Police Officials prior to 2008 is being recast and case of the petitioner shall also be decided in the revised seniority.

That being so, learned counsel for the parties are ad idem that the order being assailed, dated 28.01.2013 (Annexure P6), has lost its significance and be thus set aside. Ordered accordingly.

In the wake of the position as set out above, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that nothing substantive survives in this petition and the same be disposed of as having become infructuous.

Disposed of as having become infructuous.

**( Arun Palli )**  
**Judge**

May 18, 2015

