

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

CWP No. 244 of 2000

Date of decision: 09.02.2017

Chanan Singh Thind

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present: None for the petitioner.

Mr. L.S. Virk, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

JAISHREE THAKUR, J. (ORAL)

The instant writ petition has been filed for issuance of a writ of certiorari or any other appropriate writ or direction for quashing of gradation list dated 01.01.1988 as well as order dated 10.12.1999 (Annexure P-9) whereby respondents No. 3 & 4 have been promoted to the post of Superintending Engineers despite the fact that the petitioner is senior to them.

A separate written statement has been filed by respondents No.1 & 2, wherein in the preliminary objections, it is stated that gradation and distribution list which is sought to be quashed dated 01.01.1988 is only a statement of service particulars of officers and it cannot be reckoned as a seniority list of the officers of each cadre. It is also submitted therein that as per Government instructions issued vide No. 16355-8GS-62/42251 dated 24.11.1962 the inter se seniority amongst the direct recruits is required to be maintained in the order of merit recommended by the Punjab Public Service Commission. The Punjab Public Service Commission has finalized the

seniority list and the same was circulated on 28.09.1984 and the name of the petitioner is reflected at Sr. No. 133 whereas respondents No. 3 to 13 are shown senior to him.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents-State contends that any promotions that have been made in accordance with law. The seniority list that has been prepared by the Punjab Public Service Commission and that seniority list is not under challenge in these proceedings.

No one has put in appearance on behalf of the petitioner.

I have heard learned counsel for the respondents-State.

In view of the categoric stand taken that the gradation list under challenge in the writ petition does not reflect the exact seniority list which has been prepared in the year 1984 in consultation with the Punjab Public Service Commission, no further orders are called for in this writ petition and the same is dismissed.

However, if the petitioner, who is unrepresented, feels the need to controvert the submissions made herein, he is at liberty to approach this Court and file an application for revival of the writ petition.

09.02.2017

Satyawan

**(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes.
No.