

209

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

1. CWP-5196-2012 (O&M)

AMRIT SINGH AND OTHERS

...Petitioners

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

...Respondents

2. CWP-20335-2011 (O&M)

SATNAM CHAND AND OTHERS

...Petitioners

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

...Respondents

3. CWP-22236-2011

RAJINDER SINGH AND OTHERS

...Petitioners

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

...Respondents

Date of decision: 24.08.2022

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present:- Mr. K. G. Chauhary, Advocate and
Ms. Sakshi Singh, Advocate
for the petitioners in CWP-5196-2012.

None for the petitioners in
CWP-20335-2011 & CWP-22236-2011.

Mr. Vaneet Soni, Advocate
for respondent Nos. 4 and 6 in CWP-20335-2011,
for respondent Nos. 12 and 14 in CWP-22236-2011 &
for respondent Nos. 16, 18, 28, 31 & 33 in CWP-5196-2012.

Mr. Raj Sumer Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Mansur Ali, Advocate
for respondent No.12 in CWP-22236-2011.

Mr. Yagyadeep, Advocate
for respondent Nos.6, 11, 17, 34, 46 and 47 in CWP-5196-2012.

Mr. Arjun Dhaliwal, Advocate for
Ms. Deepali Puri, Advocate
for respondent Nos. 8 to 13 in CWP-20335-2011 &
for respondent Nos. 9, 10, 16, 19, 20 and 21 in CWP-22236-2011.

Mr. Sukhbir Singh, Advocate
for respondent No.15 in CWP-5196-2012.

Mr. R. Kartikeya, Advocate
for respondent Nos.9, 13, 36 and 39 in CWP-5196-2012.

JAISHREE THAKUR, J. (Oral)

By this common order this Court proposes to dispose of the above noted three writ petitions.

For the sake of convenience, the facts are being taken from CWP No.5196 of 2012, titled as "*Amrit Singh and others versus State of Punjab and others.*"

In brief, the facts are that the petitioners herein, who had been appointed as Constables in the Punjab Police and had worked for a considerable length of time had been promoted as Head Constables and subsequently, sought promotion as Assistant Sub-Inspectors. It was claimed that despite putting in more than 22 years of service (as on the date of filing the present writ petition) the case of the petitioners for promotion to the next rank i.e. to the rank of Assistant Sub-Inspector was not being considered and persons junior to them were being appointed in various districts. It is submitted that promotion was being denied to

them despite the fact that the petitioners had completed the Intermediate School Course in relevant years going back to the year 2011.

Pursuant to notice of motion having been issued, State has filed a short reply in all the three matters, wherein a categorical stand has been taken that on due consideration, the petitioners have been promoted and, therefore, the present writ petitions would not survive. Short reply by way of an affidavit of Sh. Navjot Singh Mahal, PPS, Assistant Inspector General of Police, PAP Jalandhar on behalf of respondent Nos.1 to 3 has been filed in Court today. Relevant para 5 of the said affidavit would reflect the position regarding the promotion of the petitioners in CWP No.5196 of 2012. 55 petitioners have been promoted, whereas 5 petitioners are stated to have either expired or retired from service in the rank of Assistant Sub-Inspectors. Similar is the stand that has also been taken in the other two connected matters. The affidavits are taken on record, copy of which have been furnished to learned counsel for the petitioners in Court today.

In view of the categorical stand taken that promotions have been given to the petitioners, all the three writ petitions are disposed of having rendered infructuous leaving it open to the petitioners to file afresh in case, any grievance still survived.

Any miscellaneous applications pending in these writ petitions also stand disposed of.

24.08.2022
Chetan Thakur

(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No