

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

CWP No.3575 of 2015

Date of Decision : 27.2.2015

Jagtar Singh and others

....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE MAHESH GROVER

....

1. Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers 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?

Present: Mr.Madhav Pokhrel, Advocate
for the petitioners.

MAHESH GROVER, J.

Petitioners pray for promotion and impugn the order dated 6.9.2013 by which their claim has been rejected.

The petitioners are working as Social Studies Master. They had filed CWP No.11196 of 2011 praying for fixation of seniority w.e.f. 1.1.1997. The said writ petition was disposed of on 31.5.2012 with a direction to the petitioners to submit representations/objections to the proposed seniority list which finally resulted in the seniority list of 19.7.2013. The petitioners press for their claim of promotion on the ground that juniors to them have been promoted. The official respondents in the

meantime had started reviewing the case of all the incumbents who stood promoted as Lecturers and held a Departmental Promotion Committee. Ostensible purpose of conducting such an exercise was to weed out/revert the incumbents who had wrongly been promoted on the basis of an earlier seniority which was rectified finally in July 2013.

In the review the committee observed that the petitioners who belong to Scheduled Castes have been assigned seniority Nos.1286, 2432 and 5599 (wrongly recorded as 5597 in the order) and the employees who had been promoted from amongst Scheduled Castes reached upto the seniority No.1247, implying thereby that the petitioners do not make it to the zone of consideration being lower in seniority. The petitioners do not impugn this seniority and the position assigned to them. Neither do they dispute the fact that they do not make it to the zone of consideration. The only grievance that the petitioners raised in this petition is that certain persons who ought to have been reverted in the review exercise conducted by the respondents have not been so reverted.

If the prayer of the petitioners in the writ petition is to be seen, then it centers around their own promotion and the learned counsel for the petitioners has candidly conceded that none of the petitioners make it to the zone of consideration which

would imply that the findings recorded in the impugned order are correct. The claim of the petitioners, therefore, is absolutely without any basis. Their plea for reversion of respondents No.3 to 5 cannot be accepted as there is no prayer in this regard made in this petition. The petition is, therefore, held to be without any merit and is dismissed.

27.2.2015
dss

(MAHESH GROVER)
JUDGE