

HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

205 CM-10019-CWP-2021 IN
CWP-7252-2019 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 01.09.2021

Sube Singh

... Petitioner

VS.

State of Haryana & Ors.

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE GIRISH AGNIHOTRI

Present: Mr. SS Sahu, Advocate for the applicant/petitioner

Ms. Safia Gupta, AAG Haryana

GIRISH AGNIHOTRI, J. (Oral)

The matter has been taken up through video conferencing on account of restrictions due to outbreak of COVID-19 pandemic.

With the consent of learned counsel for the parties, the main case is taken on board for final disposal.

The petitioner, *inter alia*, seeks a direction to respondents No.2 & 3 to fix the *inter se* seniority of the petitioner from the date he actually became eligible to take B-1 test in terms of the amended Rule 3 sub-rule A & B of the Punjab Police Rules. A further direction is sought to the official respondents to recommend the name of the petitioner for intermediate school course from the date Mohinder Singh has been recommended i.e. 31.12.2018.

In the aforesaid application, the following order was passed on 06.08.2021:-

*“The applicant/petitioner has moved this application, inter alia, with a prayer to dispose of the writ petition in terms of the order dated 15.07.2021 passed in **CWP-4739-2019 (Satyawan & Anr. Vs. State of Haryana & Ors.)**.”*

“Notice of the application.

On the asking, Mr. Rohit Arya, DAG Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the respondents through video conferencing.

Considering the urgency involved in the matter, the respondents are directed to file a short affidavit as to if the case of the petitioner is covered by the decision of this Court in Satyawan & Anr. case (cited supra).

List on 13.08.2021.

Learned counsel for the applicant/petitioner is directed to supply a copy of the application to learned State counsel during the course of day.”

Learned State counsel, on instructions from the Department submits that the affidavit of Sh. Dheeraj Setia dated 22.08.2021 has been filed. In para 3 thereof, it has been *inter alia* stated that the facts of the case of the petitioner and that of Satyawan are of similar in nature thus the case of the petitioner is covered by the said decision.

In view of the above, the present writ petition disposed of in terms of Satyawan & Anr. case (supra).

Disposed of accordingly.

01.09.2021

vishal shonkar

1. Whether speaking/reasoned?
2. Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No

**(Girish Agnihotri)
Judge**