

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

Date of decision: 02.05.2017

1. CWP No. 24752 of 2016

Shiv Ram and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

2. CWP No. 27289 of 2016

Jaswinder Singh and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

3. CWP No. 27296 of 2016

Balwinder Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

4. CWP No. 1525 of 2017

Jagdev Singh and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present: Mr. H.C. Arora, Advocate,
for the petitioners in CWP No. 24752 of 2016.

Mr. Surinder Garg, Advocate,
for the petitioners in CWP No. 27289 of 2016.

Mr. Sunny Bhardwaj, Advocate,
for the petitioners in CWP No. 27296 of 2016.

Mr. Dhruvwinder Brar, Advocate,
for the petitioners in CWP No. 1525 of 2017.

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

JAISHREE THAKUR, J. (ORAL)

1. By this common order, I propose to dispose of above referred four writ petitions. For brevity, facts are being extracted from **CWP No. 24752 of 2016**.

2. The petitioners herein were candidates who had applied for recruitment to the posts of Jail Warders pursuant to an advertisement No. 2 of 2011. The selection process that was initiated pursuant to the said advertisement became a subject matter of litigation before this Court in **CWP No. 15409 of 2014** titled as **Lachhman Singh and others vs. State of Punjab and others**. While the matter was pending consideration before this Court, the respondents issued another advertisement to fill up 210 posts of Jail Warders by an advertisement dated 08.11.2016. The petitioners contended in the writ petitions filed that once the vacancies had not been filled up pursuant to the advertisement issued in the year 2011, no fresh advertisement could be issued. It was contended that on account of age criteria, the petitioners would not be able to participate in the fresh selection process that was issued.

3. Reply was filed to the writ petition.

4. By an order dated 03.02.2017, learned counsel for the respondents -State was directed to file an additional affidavit to inform this Court as to whether 210 posts which had been advertised in the year 2016 had been carved out of vacancies that had been advertised in the year 2011.

Pursuant thereto an additional affidavit of Suriunder Pal Khanna, Assistant Inspector General of Prisons, Punjab has been filed in Court today wherein it is stated that 210 posts of Jail Warders which have been advertised on 08.11.2016 have not been taken out of 527 vacancies that arose pursuant to the advertisement issued in the year 2011. 527 posts of Jail Warders in dispute have nothing to do with 210 posts advertised in the year 2016.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have also perused the additional affidavit filed in Court today.

6. In view of the fact that a categorical statement has been made that the recruitment process initiated in the year 2016 has not been carved out of the vacancies that were advertised in the year 2011, no further orders are called for in these writ petitions which are hereby dismissed.

7. The interim orders issued on 01.12.2016 are hereby vacated leaving it open to the respondents to proceed further with the advertisement issued on 08.11.2016.

02.05.2017

Satyawan

Whether speaking/reasoned

Whether reportable

(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE

Yes.

No.