

**CWP No. 23248 of 2017**

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

**CWP No. 23248 of 2017 (O&M)**

**Date of Decision: 13.10.2017**

**Anand Parkash**

**.....Petitioner**

**Vs.**

**State of Haryana and others**

**.....Respondents**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH**

Present: Mr. Kuldeep Singh Yadav, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.

\*\*\*\*\*

**AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (ORAL)**

The petitioner has been reverted on the basis of the fact that the policy dated 15.05.2015 had been stayed by a co-ordinate Bench, vide its order dated 27.05.2015, passed in CWP No. 11073 of 2015.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the said petition was referred to a Division Bench, which stayed reversion of all promotions already made, vide its order dated 28.11.2015 (passed in the same writ petition).

A copy of that order has been produced in Court, which shows that reversions of those persons who already stood promoted, were stayed by the Division Bench, (on 28.11.2015).

The petitioner having been promoted in the year 2017, well after the policy of the Haryana Government dated 15.05.2015 had been stayed by this Court, providing for reservation even to the extent of 25% in Class III and IV posts, I do not see how the petitioners' promotions can be sustained, having been made against a roster point on 17.08.2016, to the post of a Junior Assistant, and

**CWP No. 23248 of 2017**

further promotion again on a roster point, to the post of a Senior Accountant, on 27.04.2017.

Hence, the contention of learned counsel for the petitioner to the effect that he was promoted without giving him a hearing, at this stage cannot be entertained in my opinion, in view of what has already stated hereinabove, i.e. this Court having stayed the operation of the policy itself in the year 2015, with the petitioner not promoted at that stage, he could not have been promoted in the first place in the years 2016 and 2017, against roster points.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has also relied upon orders passed by a co-ordinate Bench staying reversion in the year 2017 itself, in CWP No. 9300 of 2017.

Be that so, in view of the fact that a Division Bench is seized of the matter and has not stayed operation of the order staying the policy, (also by a co-ordinate Bench), I see no reason to entertain this petition, for the reasons already given hereinabove.

Consequently, it is dismissed in *limine* but with no orders as to costs.

**October 13, 2017**  
nitin

**(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)**  
**JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes

Whether Reportable Yes