

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-24302-2019

Date of Decision:-04.09.2019.

Amritpal Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

Present: Mr. A.K. Walia, Advocate for the petitioner.

ARUN MONGA, J. (Oral)

Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends that the case of the petitioner is squarely covered by a judgment dated 11.03.2015 rendered by this Court in CWP-13493-2010 (Annexure P-12). He further submits that the petitioner, without any cogent reason, has been denied the benefit of reservation of 2% quota meant for Wards of Police Personnel in recruitment of Constables in District Police Cadre and Armed Police Cadre in State of Punjab. Counsel further contends that the petitioner had applied for the post of Constable against that quota vide advertisements dated 31.05.2016 and dated 15.10.2016 (Annexures P-4 and P-6, respectively) and pursuant thereto, he was issued admit card (Annexures P-5 and P-7) and he participated in the written examination and physical test. However, vide provisional merit list dated 30.06.2017 (Annexure P-10), the name of the petitioner was not reflected in the same and he has been representing to the respondents thereafter, as is reflected from representations contained at Annexures P-11 (colly) and P-13.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that, in fact,

respondent No.3 had recommended the case of the petitioner to be considered

against the two percent reservation provided for the Wards of Police Personnel as is reflected from letter dated 02.01.2017 recommendation/letter contained at Annexure P-9.

3. Notice of motion.

4. On advance service of copy of the petition, Ms. Ambika Bedi, AAG, Punjab, accepts noticed on behalf of the respondent-State.

5. Heard.

6. Prima facie, though, it seems that petitioner's case is hit by delay in seeking the relief herein, however, in the peculiar circumstances, I am of the view that the delay may not be entirely attributable to the petitioner, although, he is not absolved of contributing to the delay.

7. Be that as it may, given the nature of order being passed, there is no necessity to seek return by any of the respondents, as no further proceedings and/or pleadings are required in the present case.

8. Without commenting on the merits of the case, the present writ petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondents to objectively consider the representations contained at Annexures P-11 (colly) and P-13, and also by keeping in view the averments and contentions stated in this petition by treating it as a supplementary representation and pass an appropriate order, in accordance with law.

9. Let needful be done within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. 10. Disposed of in above terms.

(ARUN MONGA)
JUDGE

September 04, 2019.

sandeep

Whether speaking/reasoned:-

Yes / No

Whether Reportable:-

Yes / No.