

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

CWP No.14255 of 2018 (O&M)

Date of decision: 30.05.2018

Kashmir Singh and others

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondent(s)

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN**

Present: Mr. J.S. Dhaliwal, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

\*\*\*\*

**Jitendra Chauhan, J. (Oral)**

By way of the present petition, the petitioners seek issuance of directions to the respondents to count the service rendered by the petitioners on the post of SPOs as qualifying service for the purpose of seniority for the post of constables and all other benefits.

Learned counsel states that at this stage he would be satisfied in case respondent No.2-Director General of Police, Punjab, Punjab Police Headquarters, Sector-9, Chandigarh is directed to consider and decide the legal notice dated 20.02.2018 (Annexure P-7) in the light of judgments passed by this Court in CR-2295-2010 titled as **Constable Rajinder Kumar Vs. State of Punjab through Principal Secretary Home, Department of Home Affairs & Justice, Mini Secretariat, Punjab, Chandigarh and others**, decided on 06.09.2010 (Annexure P-5) and in CWP-8549-2018 titled as **Satwinder Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and others**, decided on 05.04.2018 (Annexure P-8).

Heard.

In view of the above, without advertng to the merits of the case, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2-Director General of Police, Punjab, Punjab Police Headquarters, Sector-9, Chandigarh to consider and decide the legal notice dated 20.02.2018 (Annexure P-7) in the light of assertion made within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of the order. If, on consideration, the competent authority reaches to the conclusion that the case of the petitioners is at par with the petitioners in the above said judgment, the competent authority is directed to pass the consequential order within a period of six weeks thereafter. However, in case the competent authority feels that the relief claimed by the petitioners is not admissible or made out, in that case, a speaking order be passed in the matter.

30.05.2018

*sumit.k*

**(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)**  
**JUDGE**

|                             |     |    |
|-----------------------------|-----|----|
| Whether speaking/reasoned : | Yes | No |
| Whether Reportable :        | Yes | No |