

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH

R.A.No.64 of 2017 (O&M) in  
Civil Writ Petition No.3 of 2011  
Date of Decision: March 23, 2017

Parveen Kumari & others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana & others

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL, JUDGE**

Present: Mr.Puneet Bali, Senior Advocate with  
Mr.Vibhav Jain, Advocate,  
for the applicants.

Mr.Sandeep Singh Mann, Sr.DAG, Haryana,  
for the State.

\*\*\*\*\*

**AMIT RAWAL, J. (Oral)**

CM No.1675 of 2017

Prayer in the application is for impleading the applicants  
mentioned in para No.4 as respondent Nos.226 to 366.

For the reasons mentioned in the application, which is  
supported by an affidavit, the applicants are allowed to be impleaded as  
respondent Nos.226 to 366.

CM stands disposed of.

RA No.64 of 2017

The applicants are aggrieved of the action being taken by the  
State in pursuance to the order dated 6.8.2012, sought to be reviewed, on  
the premise that the applicants at the time of examination had given the

thumb impressions, which ultimately were found to be smudged. However, the applicants were called by the FSL Department to give specimen signatures without telling them that the same were to be compared and, therefore, they gave the casual signatures.

Mr.Puneet Bali, learned Senior Counsel assisted by Mr.Vibhav Jain, representing the applicants submits that had the applicants been apprised of the same, they would have given the signatures the one which they have given at the time of examination, therefore, he sought the review of the order that the specimen signatures be again taken and sent to FSL for comparison.

Mr.Sandeep Singh Mann, learned Sr.DAG, Haryana submits that though the applicants should have been careful in giving the signatures, but does not dispute the similar orders passed by this Court granting liberty to set of about 250 persons to give the specimen signatures afresh.

Resultantly, the order under challenge is modified to the extent that the respondents will call the applicants to give the specimen signatures with a clear indication that the same would be compared. Let this exercise be done, within reasonable time.

With the aforementioned modification, the review application stands disposed of.

Till then, no coercive method shall be taken against the applicants.

**March 23, 2017**  
**ramesh**

**( AMIT RAWAL )**  
**JUDGE**

**Whether speaking/reasoned**  
**Whether Reportable:**

**Yes/No**  
**Yes/No**