

[239] IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

[1] COCP No.2226 of 2021
Date of Decision : 30.03.2022

Manpreet Singh and another ...Petitioners

Versus

Inder Preet Singh Sahota, Director General
of Police, ChandigarhRespondent

[2] COCP No.1951 of 2021

Jaswant Singh ...Petitioner

Versus

Vini Mahajan, Secretary, Department of
Home Affairs, Punjab and anotherRespondents

[3] COCP No.2178 of 2021

Birbal Singh and another ...Petitioners

Versus

Anurag Verma, Principal Secretary, Department
of Home Affairs and Justice, Govt. of Punjab,
Chandigarh and anotherRespondents

[4] COCP No.2180 of 2021

Arjun Singh Gill ...Petitioner

Versus

Anurag Verma, Principal Secretary, Department of
Home Affairs and Justice, Govt. of Punjab and anotherRespondents

[5] COCP No.2186 of 2021

Mintu Singh ...Petitioner

Versus

Anirudh Tiwari, Chief Secretary, Govt. of
Punjab and anotherRespondents

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice B.S. Walia

Present : Mr. Baljinder Singh Ichhewal, Advocate
for the petitioners in COCP No.2226 of 2021.

Mr. Damanjeet Bhoriwal, Advocate for the petitioner
in COCP No.1951 of 2021.

Mr. Sardavinder Goyal, Advocate with
Mr. Raj Kumar Selwan, Advocate for the petitioners
in COCP Nos.2178, 2180 & 2186 of 2021.

Ms. Deepali Puri, Addl. AG, Punjab.

B.S. Walia, J. (Oral)

[1] This order shall decide COCP Nos. 2226, 1951, 2178, 2180, & 2186 of 2021 as the grievance in all petitions is of violation of common judgment in CWP No. 2295 of 2016.

[2] Facts of the case are being taken from COCP No.2226/ 2021.

[3] Prayer in the instant petition is for initiating action against the respondent for intentional and willful defiance of order Annexure P-1, dated 05.07.2021 in CWP No.20390 of 2020.

[4] Learned counsel contends that CWP No.20390 of 2020 was disposed of vide order, Annexure P-1, dated 05.07.2021 by directing re-measurement of the height of the petitioners in terms of the decision in CWP No.23875 of 2016 in case titled as '**Sonu Singh** versus **State of Haryana and others**'.

[5] Learned counsel contends that the instant petition was filed on account of failure of the respondents to do the needful in terms of orders dated 05.07.2021 in CWP No.20390 of 2020 which was disposed

of in terms of the decision in CWP No.22985 of 2016.

[6] Reply has been filed on behalf of the respondent. Learned Addl. AG, Punjab on the basis of reply as well as Annexure R-1, contends that there is no change in the height of the petitioners on re-measurement through digital *stadiometer*, *consequently* there is no change in the total marks awarded to the petitioners, resultantly the petitioners do not fall in the selection zone. Copy of the reply has already been supplied to learned counsel for the petitioners, who on perusal of order (Annexure R-1) state that in view of re-measurement of the height of the petitioners having been got carried out by the respondent with a digital *stadiometer* and there being no change in the total marks awarded to the petitioners pursuant to re-measurement, *consequently*, the petitioners not falling in the selection zone, the petitioners do not press the instant petition but pray for liberty to challenge re-measurement of their height carried out by the respondent by way of appropriate proceedings, in accordance with law.

[7] The same is not opposed to by the learned State Counsel.

[8] In view of the above, as well as statement of learned counsel for the petitioners, the instant petition is disposed of as not calling for any action against the respondent(s) under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, while granting liberty to the petitioners, as prayed for.

[9] *Rule discharged.*

(B.S. Walia)
Judge

30.03.2022

'Rajneesh'

Whether speaking/ reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No