

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH.**

CWP No.4723 of 2017

Date of Decision:-27.03.2017

Kuljit Singh.

.....Petitioner.

Versus

State of Punjab & Ors.

.....Respondents.

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASWANT SINGH

Present:- Mr. Jagraj S. Khiva, Advocate for the Petitioner.

JASWANT SINGH, J.(ORAL)

Present petition is a classic case of ill advice and frivolous litigation initiated by the petitioner who is claiming a government job in Punjab Police on the basis of letter dated 08.11.2011 (P-2) and new Policy dated 3.3.2014 (P-6).

It is contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that in view of the letter dated 08.11.2011 as well as new Policy framed by the State Government on 3.3.2014, the petitioner is entitled for a government job in Punjab Police, however, vide Annexure P-7 Deputy Commissioner, Mansa has wrongly dismissed the claim of the petitioner by misinterpreting the aforementioned letter as well as Policy.

After hearing learned Counsel for the petitioner and perusing the paper book this Court is of the considered view that the present petition

is devoid of any merit and the same is hereby dismissed.

It is not in dispute that as per the Policy framed by the Government (which is not even under challenge) no person is entitled for consideration for government job whose land less than 4 Kanals have been acquired. Admittedly, land acquired of the petitioner is 1 Kanal 09 Marlas.

At this stage, learned Counsel for the petitioner has relied upon a condition of the Policy that in case the holding of a claimant remains less than 2-1/2 acres after acquisition then his case can be considered for government job. This argument is also completely misconceived and liable to be rejected. A perusal of the said condition would reveal that it is only under exceptional hardship that a person can be considered for a claim to a government job. It does not *ipso facto* fructify his right to claim a job. There are numerous circumstances which are required to be seen by the State before considering the claims for government job. Present case does not fall under such category as admittedly the petitioner still has a landholding 2 Acres 2 Kanals and 15 Marlas. No exceptional circumstance has been pointed out so as to bring the case of the petitioner within the category of exceptional hardship.

In view of the above, present writ petition is hereby dismissed.

(JASWANT SINGH)
JUDGE

March 27, 2017
Vinay

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No