

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

Date of decision : 26th of May, 2023

205

1. **CWP-2208-2017**
JAIMAL SINGH V/S DIRECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE, PUNJAB,
CHANDIGARH AND ANR.
2. **CWP-2247-2017**
KAPILDEV SINGH V/S DIRECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE, PUNJAB,
CHANDIGARH AND ANR.
3. **CWP-10904-2017**
BALKARAN SINGH V/S STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS.
4. **CWP-11005-2017**
PARGAT SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER
5. **CWP-6799-2019**
JAGDEEP SINGH V/S STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS
6. **CWP-33325-2019**
KASHMIR SINGH V/S STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER
7. **CWP-3794-2019**
HARJINDER SINGH V/S STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER
8. **CWP-20844-2020**
AMRINDER SINGH VS. STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS
9. **CWP-8767-2019**
HARDEEP SINGH V/S STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER
10. **CWP-24269-2016 (O&M)**
GOBIND DASS SINGH & ORS V/S DIRECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE
11. **CWP-2384-2017 (O&M)**
RAMESH SINGH V/S STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS
12. **CWP-3652-2017**
MANGAL SINGH V/S DIRECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE PUNJAB & ANR
13. **CWP-625-2017**
LAKHVIR SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANR
14. **CWP-4395-2017**
MALKIT SINGH V/S STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANR.
15. **CWP-12833-2018**
TARSEM LAL V/S STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANR
16. **CWP-6820-2018**
GURLAL SINGH V/S STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANR
17. **CWP-6873-2019**
GURMEET SINGH V/S STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

18. **CWP-24748-2016**
HARVINDER SINGH V/S DIRECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE PUNJAB
19. **CWP-13232-2018**
HARPAL SINGH V/S STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS.
20. **CWP-18529-2018**
JATINDER PAL SINGH V/S STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS
21. **CWP-18839-2018**
RANJIT SINGH V/S STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS
22. **CWP-2518-2017**
HARPREET SINGH & ORS V/S STATE OF PUNJAB & ORS
23. **CWP-15697-2017**
BALJIT SINGH V/S STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS
24. **CWP-25690-2016**
BALWINDER SINGH V/S STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS
25. **CWP-720-2017**
BALWANT SINGH AND ANR V/S DIRECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE
PUNJAB CHANDIGARH SECTOR 9 CHANDIGARH
26. **CWP-12381-2017**
AMANDEEP SINGH GILL V/S STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER
27. **CWP-18497-2017**
SHAMSHER SINGH V/S STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS.
28. **CWP-3575-2017**
GURWINDER SINGH V/S STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANR
29. **CWP-11735-2020**
HARPREET SINGH V/S STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS
30. **CWP-15131-2019**
LAKHWINDER SINGH AND ORS V/S STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANR
31. **CWP-18827-2018**
MOHIT GILL AND ANR V/S STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS
32. **CWP-18842-2018**
GURDAS SINGH V/S STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS
33. **CWP-25611-2017**
MANJIT SINGH V/S STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS
34. **CWP-2378-2021**
BALJINDER SINGH V/S DIRECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE AND ORS
35. **CWP-26642-2017 (O&M)**
MAKHAN SINGH V/S STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

36. **CWP-30002-2019**
BALWINDER SINGH V/S DIRECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE AND ORS
37. **CWP-6466-2019**
GURPREET SINGH V/S STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANR.
38. **CWP-23871-2019**
RAJINDER SINGH V/S STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER
39. **CWP-26725-2016**
MANINDER SINGH V/S STATE OF PUNJAB & ANR
40. **CWP-11851-2017 (O&M)**
KULDIP SINGH V/S STATE OF PUNJAB & ORS
41. **CWP-19486-2019**
GURCHARAN SINGH V/S STATE OF PUNJAB & ORS
42. **CWP-25349-2021**
JAGTAR SINGH V/S DIRECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE, PUNJAB AND OTHERS
43. **CWP-12913-2021**
MOTHA SINGH AND ORS V/S STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS
44. **CWP-20104-2017**
DARSHAN SINGH & ORS V/S STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS
45. **CWP-3863-2023**
PREM SINGH AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS
46. **CWP-2390-2023**
SHARANJIT SINGH V/S STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER
47. **CWP-16636-2021**
PARDEEP SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS
48. **CWP-12212-2019**
GAURAV SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS
49. **CWP-14524-2021**
KULDEEP SINGH AND ANR V/S STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS
50. **CWP-32026-2019 (O&M)**
LAKHWINDER SINGH V/S STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS
51. **CWP-7213-2020 (O&M)**
GURVINDER SINGH AND ORS VS. STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS
52. **CWP-17581-2017**
GURPREET SINGH AND OTHERS. V/S STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

206

CWP-6938-2017

SARBJIT KAUR V/S STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present : For the petitioners :

Mr. Manmeet Singh Rana, Advocate
Mr. Pardeep Kumar Kapila, Advocate
Mr. Ranjodh Singh Sidhu, Advocate
Ms. Sonia G. Singh Samber, Advocate
Mr. Pardeep Singh Mirpur, Advocate
Ms. Ritam Aggarwal, Advocate
Ms. Anshul Mangla, Advocate
Mr. Rajesh Narang, Advocate
Mr. Amit Shukla, Advocate
Mr. J.S.Dhaliwal, Advocate
Mr. B.B.S.Randhawa, Advocate
Mr. Ashwani Katter, Advocate for
Mr. L.M.Gulati, Advocate
Mr. Parminder Singh, Advocate
Mr. Karan Bhardwaj, Advocate and
Mr. Jasbir Singh Mohri, Advocate
Mr. Ripudaman Singh Sidhu, Advocate
Mr. Sunpreet Singh, Advocate for
Mr. P.S.Dhaliwal, Advocate
Mr. Pardeep Singh Mirpur, Advocate
Mr. Rahul Vohra, Advocate for
Mr. Aditya Jain, Advocate
Mr. Gagneshwar Walia, Advocate
Mr. Sapan Dhir, Advocate
Mr. Karan Singh, Advocate for
Mr. R.K. Choudhary, Advocate
Mr. S.K. Arora, Advocate
Mr. Tribhavan Singla, Advocate
Mr. Sachin Kalia, Advocate for
Mr. N.K. Manchanda, Advocate
Mr. Parminder Singh, Advocate
Mr. H.C. Arora, Advocate
Mr. Balbir S. Sewak, Advocate.

For the State :

Mr. Vikas Mohan Gupta, Addl. A.G., Punjab with
Mr. Aman Dhir, Dy. A.G., Punjab and
Mr. I.P.S. Kang, Asstt. A.G., Punjab.

PANKAJ JAIN, J.

CM-19677-CWP-2021 in CWP-19486-2019

This is an application for preponement of the main writ petition.

For the reasons recorded in the application, the same is allowed. CWP-19486-2019 is taken on Board today itself.

Main Writ Petitions

The present batch of writ petitions relates to recruitment of 7416 Constables (male and female) in District Police Cadre and Armed Police Cadre of Punjab Police Services initiated vide Advertisement dated 31st of May, 2016. Standing Order No.1 of 2016 was issued by Director General of Police exercising powers under Section 4(d) and Section 45(g) of the Punjab Police Act, 2007. As per the Advertisement, merits list was to be carved on the basis of marks obtained by the candidates in physical measurement test, the essential qualification i.e. 10+2 and an interview-cum-personality test. Clause X of the advertisement prescribed that the interview-cum-personality test shall carry 4 marks. On 26th of September, 2016, Standing Order No.1 of 2016 was amended. Interview-cum-personality test was given up and to that effect a news item was published on 30th of September, 2016. As a result thereof, merit list was carved on the

basis of marks obtained by the candidates in physical measurement test and 10+2. Result was declared on 1st of October, 2016.

2. This Court was flooded with civil writ petitions. Primary challenge was to the amendment in the Standing Order. Some of the writ petitioners raised their grievance *qua* measurement of height too. Vide order dated 25th of April, 2018 Writ Court ordered re-measurement of the height of the candidates. State preferred review petition i.e. RA No.155 of 2018. The same was dismissed on 2nd of July, 2018. State preferred *Intra-court* Appeal i.e. LPA No.1263 of 2018. Order dated 25th of April, 2018 was stayed. LPA Bench vide order dated 29th of March, 2021 remitted appeals back to the Single Bench for final adjudication and further directed that the order dated 25th of April 2018 be kept in abeyance. The bunch of aforesaid writ petitions now stands decided by Writ Court vide order dated 5th of July, 2021 with the aforesaid directions :

“39. To sum up in the end, hereinbelow are the succinct conclusions drawn and directions of the Court in the instant judgment:-

- i). The criteria of selection as per the original advertisement read with the standing order, is upheld and the petitioners’ challenge thereto is rejected. Dispensing with the interviews for the post of Constable being Group-C which is in tune with the guidelines issued by the Government of India and the policy decision of the State Government dispensing with the interview is also upheld. ii). The grievance of the petitioners *qua* measurement of height would be mitigated by the State by carrying out one time re-measurement of their height in terms of judgment

rendered by this Court in *Sonu Singh's* case, *ibid*. It is so ordered accordingly.

- iii) All the petitioners be notified of the date, time and venue for remeasurement of height through email/ text message as well on the website of the department. Those who opt for remeasurement, the exercise for their remeasurement of height and the resultant changes concerning the concerned petitioners in selection shall be completed within the next one month.
- iv) If any of the concerned aggrieved petitioners is/are selected, he/they be issued letters of appointment within the next two months. Candidates who have already undergone remeasurement test during pendency of proceedings would be given benefit thereof, if any, in accordance with remeasured height.
- v). If upon re-measurement of height, any petitioner comes above the previously selected candidate in the respective category viz. General or otherwise, in that event the already selected candidate on the bottom of list in the said category shall have to make way for him, in case there is no vacancy available. Needless to say that in case vacancies still exists, then the newly selected candidate shall be accommodated in accordance with his merit.
- vi) A writ of mandamus is issued to the State of Punjab that henceforth it shall ensure that the guidelines, contained in *Sonu Singh's* case, *ibid* are made mandatory in every recruitment to be carried out in Punjab Police and other departments where height is one of the criteria for selection.
- vii) All other cases wherein additional issues, other than the challenge to criteria as per advertisement read with standing order and measurement of height, are being de-tagged vide a separate order to be reheard on their individual merits, only to the extent the issues raised

therein have not been dealt with in this judgment.”

3. The aforesaid judgment passed by Single Bench dismissing of more than 159 writ petitions was challenged before the Division Bench with LPA No.961 of 2021 being the lead case. The *Intra-Court Appeals* stand dismissed vide order dated 16th of May, 2022 upholding the judgment passed by Single Judge. The Division Bench also considered the claim of the petitioners who were initially declared successful but have lost to the more meritorious candidates as per fresh merit list revised owing to re-measurement of heights of the candidates. The Division Bench held as under :

“Regarding the grouse of some of the candidates who had been initially declared successful but on account of the directions of remeasurement being passed vide interim orders, have now been moved out of the zone of consideration. The relief is not liable to be granted to them since on the very first date i.e. 06.12.2016, the order had been passed that selection and appointment of Constables shall be subject to the decision of the writ petition. The said order reads as under:

“Ms. Sudeepti Sharma, DAG, Punjab has put in appearance on behalf of the respondents/State and prays for time to file reply. Service is complete. Adjourned to 22.03.2017. In the meanwhile, the selection and appointment of the Constables against advertised posts vide Advt. No. 01/2016, dated 31.05.2016, shall be subject to the decision of the writ petition.”

Thus, for the said persons who are appointed were well aware of the pendency of the writ petition and now cannot turn

around and say that they were not heard at the time of the writ petition. The writ petitions remained pending before the learned Single Judge and various interim orders were passed and eventually it was only decided on 05.07.2021 and they had ample opportunity to join the proceedings but chose not to do so. Thus they cannot now turn around and say that any order has been passed on their back.”

4. The present writ petitions could not be decided with the earlier batch of writ petitions as the petitioners claimed that their merit has not been considered *qua* the reserved category they opted for. The material issues arising in this batch of writ petitions are :

- (a) There are some writs wherein candidates who applied under SC category claimed that no sub-option of SC (R&O) or SC (M&B) was provided. Thus they could not specify their category and thus could not be considered in the category, they belong;
- (b) In some writ petitions contention is that the candidates despite having applied for Wards of Police Personnel (WPP) Category were not considered under the same;
- (c) Some petitioners are here claiming that Ex-servicemen were not granted extra marks for Special Forces;
- (d) Some alleged that Wards of Ex-servicemen were not considered under the category;
- (e) In some of the writ petitions, it has been claimed that the applicants under the Freedom Fighter Category have not been granted benefit; and
- (f) Lastly, 17 writ petitions are on behalf of those 17 candidates who got selected pursuant to result dated 26th of October, 2016

but could not find their names on revision of the merit list on 20th of May, 2017 and 18th of May, 2022.

5. State while responding to the averments made in the writ petition has filed response claiming that judgment rendered by the Writ Court in CWP No.22985 of 2016 stands complied in its letter and spirit. The grievance of the petitioners case-wise has been considered. Issue wise response of the State is as under :

6. *Qua* Issue No.1 i.e. the candidates who feel aggrieved as no sub-option of SC (R&O) and SC (M&B) was provided in the online form and thus their case were prejudiced, the State is stated to have duly considered the grievance of all the writ petitioners in 21 writ petitions. The marks obtained by them have been considered against the cut-off marks as per the revised merit list dated 18th of May, 2022 and it has been claimed that no candidate who is lower in merit than the last selected candidate i.e. as per revised merit list dated 18th of May, 2022, has been granted appointment. On doing such exercise, petitioner Gurjeet Singh in CWP No.21605 of 2018 stands selected in Armed Police Cadre in the category of ESM SC (M&B). Petitioner No.2-Jagtar Singh in CWP No.24345 of 2016 applied only in District Cadres in ESM (SC). On due consideration, he figures in the waiting list at Sr. No.3 in his category in District Police Cadre. Petitioner-Nirbhai Singh on reconsideration finds place at Sr. No.38 in the Armed Police Cadre in ESM SC (M&B) Category. Petitioner-Mandeep Singh in CWP No.28446 of 2017 stands selected at Sr. No.14 in

the Armed Police Cadre in ESM SC (M&B) Category. Petitioner No.3 namely Shiv Raj Singh in CWP No.497 of 2017 stands selected at Sr. No.39 in the Armed Police Cadre ESM SC (M&B) Category. Petitioner Mangal Singh in CWP No.3652 of 2017 who applied only for the District Cadre has been granted 2 marks for having served in NSG and now figures in the waiting list of ESM SC (M&B) at Sr. No.3 in District Police Cadre. Petitioner-N.K. Balwinder Singh in CWP No.12039 of 2018 stands selected at Sr. No.50 in the Armed Police Cadre in ESM SC (M&B) Category. Petitioner Sucha Singh in CWP No.29697 of 2017 stands selected at Sr. No.49 in the District Police Cadre in ESM SC (R&O) category. Petitioner No.1-Motha Singh along with petitioner No.3-Jaswant Singh, petitioner No.4-Balwinder Singh and petitioner No.5-Makhan Singh in CWP No.12913 of 2021 selected in ESM SC (M&B) category in the cadres they opted for as per revised merit list. Petitioner-Darshan Singh in CWP No.20104 of 2017 now finds place at Sr. No.52 in Armed Category in ESM SC (M&B) category. It has been claimed that so far as other petitioners are concerned on revision of merit list they have not been able to make up to the cut-off despite granting them the benefit of the category they wanted to be considered in.

7. *Qua* the Wards of Police Personnel, it has been claimed that none of them could make it to the merit list. *Qua* petitioner-Amrinder Singh in CWP No.20844 of 2020 it has been claimed that he failed to attach mandatory certificate while applying online and has produced a certificate

issued after declaration of result that too with delay of four years which can not be considered to ensure any benefit in his favour.

8. *Qua* candidates in Ex-servicemen Category, it has been submitted on behalf of the State that petitioner-Gobind Dass Singh in CWP No.24269 of 2016 stands selected at Sr. No.10 in the Armed Police Cadre in ESM SC (R&O) category after having been awarded extra marks for NSG. No other candidate in Ex-servicemen category has been able to make it to the cut-off marks and thus their claim has been rightly declined.

9. *Qua* candidates in the category of Lineal Descendent of Ex-Servicemen, as per the State petitioner-Sandeep Singh in CWP No.811 of 2017 now stands selected in Armed Police Cadre in SC (R&O) category at Sr. No.240.

10. *Qua* petitioners in CWP No.15131 of 2019 it has been claimed that petitioner-Lakhwinder Singh and petitioner-Sukjinder Singh applied only in District Cadre. They both relate to SC (R&O) category and as per their merit they both are in waiting list at Sr. No.38 and 29, respectively. Petitioner No.3-Lakhwinder Singh who applied in both cadres now figures in waiting list of Armed Cadre SC (R&O) at Sr. No.13. Lakhvir Singh petitioner No.2 in CWP No.11005 of 2017 applied under SC (R&O) Category in District Cadre only and figures in waiting list at Sr. No.56. Petitioner-Dalip Singh in CWP No.5853 of 2017 applied under ESM General Category. As per order dated 23rd of March, 2018 his height was remeasured. Since on re-measurement his actual height was found to be

6'4” instead of 5'11” as recorded in earlier measurement, his marks were increased from 25 to 26 and he now stands selected against female vacancy at Sr. No.14. Petitioner-Chamkaur Singh in CWP No.625 of 2017 figures in waiting list at Sr. No.50 in ESM General category. It has been further claimed that on revision of merit list on 18th of May, 2022, 14 candidates out of 38 candidates who were selected and appointed as per the original merit list and were granted interim protection by this Court have been able to make it to the revised merit list. Remaining 24 candidates whose details are as under could not make it to the merit list :

Sr. No.	Roll No.	Name	Father's Name	Cat Fill	Marks	DOB	Spl_Rem
1	3211320	Tata Singh	Sher Singh	SC(MB)	27	03.01.1994	CWP-7213-2020
2	5215371	Gursewak Singh	Gurprem Singh	SC(MB)	27	19.02.1994	CWP-12212-2019
3	5218085	Sandeep Singh	Bhola Singh	SC(MB)	27	27.02.1994	CWP-12212-2019
4	6212159	Vicky	Baldev Singh	SC(MB)	27	05.02.1994	CWP-12212-2019
5	8213517	Satnam Singh	Bhoora Singh	SC(MB)	27	10.02.1994	CWP-12212-2019
6	9221549	Raja	Amarjeet Singh	SC(MB)	27	15.02.1994	CWP-12212-2019
7	10215872	Vipandeep Singh	Jaswant Singh	SC(MB)	27	04.11.1993	CWP-12212-2019
8	13210087	Jeevan Singh	Amarjeet Singh	SC(MB)	27	04.03.1994	CWP-12212-2019
9	14211723	Hardeep Singh	Balwinder Singh	SC(MB)	27	10.03.1994	CWP-12212-2019
10	18210609	Gurpreet Singh	Kewal Singh	SC(MB)	27	16.02.1994	CWP-12212-2019
11	1516169	Komal Singh	Amar Singh	EXS(SC(MB)	21	15.04.1979	CWP-7213-2020
12	2526204	Sarwan Singh	Gulzar Singh	EXS(SC(MB)	21	24.02.1982	CWP-7213-2020
13	10519320	Kashmir Singh	Mulakh Raj	EXS(SC(MB)	21	03.12.1978	CWP-7213-2020
14	14519420	Boohar Singh	Narinjan Singh	EXS(SC(MB)	21	10.03.1980	CWP-7213-2020
15	26518665	Baljit Singh	Kaur Singh	EXS(SC(MB)	21	07.06.1980	CWP-7213-2020
16	27515875	Harjinder Singh	Piara Singh	EXS(SC(MB)	21	10.09.1979	CWP-7213-2020
17	231015436	Lakhwinder Singh	Satpal Singh	LDC EXS(SC(MB)	25	10.01.1995	CWP-32026-2019
18	4513986	Harjinder Singh	Kans Singh	EXS(SC(MB)	20	06.01.1976	CWP-7213-2020
19	21511376	Tarsem Singh	Mohinder Singh	EXS(SC(MB)	20	25.02.1977	CWP-7213-2020
20	6511369	Gurjant Singh	Mithu Singh	EXS(SC(MB)	20	09.08.1974	CWP-7213-2020
21	6517278	Nachhattar Singh	Ram Rakha Singh	EXS(SC(MB)	20	05.07.1970	CWP-7213-2020
22	26516209	Resham Singh	Gurdeep Singh	EXS(SC(MB)	20	05.06.1976	CWP-7213-2020
23	5514839	Jaswinder Singh	Karnail Singh	EXS(SC(MB)	20	08.08.1976	CWP-7213-2020
24	11518783	Rajinder Singh	Ram Saroop	EXS(SC(MB)	21	15.04.1982	CWP-7213-2020

11. It has been claimed that apart from the said 24 candidates another 60 candidates failed to make it to the merit list. However, two out of these 60 candidates got selected in SC (M&B) SC ESM) Category leaving 58 candidates. Thus after revision of list and the final selection list dated 18th of May, 2022, 82 candidates face removal and they shall be dealt in accordance with law.

12. In view of the aforesaid stand taken by the State, this Court finds that since the whole exercise has been conducted by the State in the light of judgment passed by the Writ Court in CWP No.22985 of 2016. The same stands approved in LPA No.916 of 2021 which further stands affirmed by the Apex Court in SLP No.27011 of 2022, there is no legal issue left at the hands of this Court to adjudicate *qua* the aforesaid recruitment. The State shall be bound by the final merit list dated 18th of May, 2022 and the writ petitions stand disposed off accordingly. More so, in view of the observations made by Division Bench in its judgment dated 16th of May, 2022 as reproduced in para No.2 *ibid*. Resultantly, it is ordered as under :

1	CWP-2208-2017	Dismissed
2	CWP-2247-2017	Dismissed
3	CWP-10904-2017	Allowed
4	CWP-11005-2017	Dismissed
5	CWP-6799-2019	Allowed
6	CWP-33325-2019	Dismissed
7	CWP-3794-2019	Allowed
8	CWP-20844-2020	Dismissed
9	CWP-8767-2019	Dismissed

10	CWP-24269-2016 (O&M)	Allowed <i>qua</i> petitioner No.1 and Dismissed <i>qua</i> petitioners No.2 to 5.
11	CWP-2384-2017 (O&M)	Dismissed
12	CWP-3652-2017	Allowed
13	CWP-625-2017	Dismissed <i>qua</i> petitioner No.1, 2, 4 to 9 and Allowed <i>qua</i> petitioner No.3.
14	CWP-4395-2017	Dismissed
15	CWP-12833-2018	Dismissed
16	CWP-6820-2018	Dismissed
17	CWP-6873-2019	Dismissed
18	CWP-24748-2016	Dismissed
19	CWP-13232-2018	Dismissed
20	CWP-18529-2018	Dismissed
21	CWP-18839-2018	Dismissed
22	CWP-2518-2017	Dismissed
23	CWP-15697-2017	Dismissed
24	CWP-25690-2016	Dismissed
25	CWP-720-2017	Dismissed
26	CWP-12381-2017	Dismissed
27	CWP-18497-2017	Dismissed
28	CWP-3575-2017	Allowed
29	CWP-11735-2020	Dismissed
30	CWP-15131-2019	Allowed <i>qua</i> petitioners No.1 to 3
31	CWP-18827-2018	Dismissed
32	CWP-18842-2018	Dismissed
33	CWP-25611-2017	Dismissed
34	CWP-2378-2021	Allowed
35	CWP-26642-2017 (O&M)	Dismissed
36	CWP-30002-2019	Dismissed
37	CWP-6466-2019	Allowed
38	CWP-23871-2019	Dismissed
39	CWP-26725-2016	Dismissed
40	CWP-11851-2017 (O&M)	Dismissed
41	CWP-19486-2019	Dismissed
42	CWP-25349-2021	Dismissed
43	CWP-12913-2021	Allowed <i>qua</i> petitioner No.1, 3, 4 & 5 and Dismissed <i>qua</i> petitioner No.2 & 6
44	CWP-20104-2017	Allowed <i>qua</i> petitioner No.1 and Dismissed <i>qua</i> petitioner No.2 & 3.
45	CWP-3863-2023	Dismissed
46	CWP-2390-2023	Dismissed
47	CWP-16636-2021	Dismissed
48	CWP-12212-2019	Dismissed
49	CWP-14524-2021	Dismissed
50	CWP-32026-2019 (O&M)	Dismissed

51	CWP-7213-2020	Dismissed
52	CWP-17581-2017	Dismissed
53	CWP-6938-2017	Dismissed

13. A copy of this order be kept on the files of other connected cases.

May 26, 2023
Dpr

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

(Pankaj Jain)
Judge