

2023:PHHC:042544

Ms. Gurpal Kaur, Advocate
for the petitioner (in CWP-8124-2013).

Mr. Krishan Kumar Thakur, Advocate
for the petitioner (in CWP-7436-2020, 16071-2021 and
1441-2023).

Mr. Saurabh Arora, Advocate for the petitioners
in CWP-15622-2017 and CWP-2756-2016.

Mr. A.K.Walia, Advocate for the petitioners
in CWP-21662-2013 and CWP-11284-2016.

Mr. Baljeet Singh Sidhu, Advocate
for the petitioner (in CWP-22143-2022).

Mr. H.S. Dhindsa, Advocate
for the petitioner (in CWP-25569-2012)

Mr. Lovish Arora, Advocate
Mr. Sanjeev Kumar Arora, Advocate
for the petitioner (in CWP-23718-2017).

Mr. Parvesh Kumar Saini, Advocate
for the petitioners (in CWP-12651-2018 & CWP-33335-
2019)

Mr. Vikas Mohan Gupta, Addl. AG, Punjab.

Mr. Gagandeep Singh, Advocate
for respondent no.2 in CWP-2756-2016.

Mr. G.P.S. Bal, Advocate
for respondent No.4 (in CWP-8833-2013).

Mr. Vivek Sharma, Advocate
for respondent No.5 (in CWP-8833-2013).

Mr. Sunpreet Singh, Advocate
for Mr. Sehajbir Singh, Advocate
for respondent-PSPCL (in CWP-7436-2020).

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J

1. By this order, a bunch of 22 writ petitions (details whereof
are given at the foot of the judgment) shall stand disposed of.

2. Learned counsel representing the parties are ad idem that the decision of all the writ petitions is based upon the interpretation of the policy instructions of the State with reference to reservation for the candidates belonging to Vimukt Jatis and Bajigars. Hence, the common thread which runs across all these writ petitions is based on a common issue which requires adjudication before taking up the individual cases.

3. After having heard the learned counsel representing the parties at length and on perusal of their written arguments, pleadings and the documents, in the considered opinion of the Court, the following issue arises for adjudication:-

“If the policy instructions issued by the State are categoric and crystal clear, then, whether it will be appropriate to rely upon the diverse stands taken by the State before the Court from time to time, which are irreconcilable with the policy to the extent to which they are contradictory?”

4. Article 16 of the Constitution of India enables the State to make a provision for grant of reservation in the recruitment and promotion for the persons belonging to the Scheduled Caste. The Punjab State, in order to extend the benefit of reservation, has enacted the Punjab Scheduled Caste and Backward Classes (Reservation in

Services) Act, 2006 (hereinafter referred to as '2006 Act'). Section 4 whereof provides that efforts will be made to offer 50% of the seats reserved for Scheduled Castes to the Balmikis and Majbis. As per the provisions of the 2006 Act, the Scheduled Castes have been sub-divided into 4 castes namely Balmiks, Majbi Sikhs, Ram Dasiyas and others. The constitutional validity of sub categorization amongst the Scheduled Caste by the 2006 Act is pending before a Seven Judges Bench of the Supreme Court in '**State of Punjab and others vs. Davinder Singh and others**' CA-2317-2011 and other connected cases, however, this Court is not called upon to opine on the aforesaid issue.

5. Article 341 of the Constitution of India enables the President to issue and notify a list of the Scheduled Castes for each State. Before the Supreme Court, the limited question, which arises for consideration is, "Whether sub-categorization of the reserved category is constitutionally permitted?" In fact, the interpretation of constitutional provision in '**E.V.Chinnaiah vs. State of Andhra Pradesh and others**' 2005 (1) SCC 394, is sought to be re-examined.

6. On 20.12.2001, the State issued policy instructions in exercise of the powers under Article 162 of the Constitution of India while providing for some additional reservation in direct recruitment, to the Government posts/service, for the candidates belonging to Vimukt Jatis and Bajigars, the operative part whereof reads as under:-

"It has been decided that in direct

*recruitment to Government services, **the posts***

left unfilled in the quotas reserved for Balmikis/Mazhbis, Scheduled Caste Ex-servicemen and Scheduled Caste Sportsmen, will be reserved upto 2% for the Vimukat Jatis and Bazigars. If no candidate of the Vimukat Jatis/Bazigars is eligible, the said post will then be filled by other Scheduled Castes.”

7. The learned senior counsel representing the petitioners has drawn the attention of the Court to the various affidavits filed by the State, from time to time, which undoubtedly prove the irreconcilable stands taken by the Government with regard to the interpretation of the aforesaid instructions. However, in the considered opinion of this Court, such affidavits and the judgment passed, on the basis of the aforesaid stand, would not preclude the State from changing its stand in order to implement its policy instructions. On 18.12.2020, while issuing clarification, the Government of Punjab has clarified in the following manner:-

“It is clarified that maximum number of posts to be filled up from amongst persons belonging to vimukt jatis and bazigars is 2 % of the total posts advertised for recruitment. All previous clarifications

*inconsistent with this shall stand withdrawn to
the extent of such inconsistency.”*

8. However, on 15.09.2022, after realizing its mistake, the State has withdrawn the instructions issued on 18.12.2020, while reiterating that the original instructions dated 20.12.2001 will prevail.

9. The learned senior counsel, representing the petitioners in one of the petitions, while leading from the front submits that the instructions issued on 15.09.2022 cannot operate with retrospective effect and it can be applied only with respect to the appointments which may be made prospectively. While referring to the stand taken by the State in the affidavits filed in the Court in various cases, he submits that the instructions of 2001 are required to be read accordingly. He further submits that the State is bound by the judgment passed by the Court while interpreting the 2001 instructions and the reservation is a beneficial piece of legislation, hence, it should be interpreted for the benefit of the candidates belonging to the Vimukt Jatis and Bazigars. Mr. Puneet Gupta, the learned counsel representing the certain petitioners submits that the State is consistently following the practice of reserving 2% of the total advertised posts for Vimukt Jatis and Bazigars. Hence, the State cannot approbate and reprobate. The other learned counsel representing the petitioners in the various other connected writ petitions have adopted the arguments of Sh.Patwalia and Sh.Puneet Gupta.

10. On the other hand, the learned State counsel submits that for the posts falling in Class C and D, the State has made reservation to the extent of 25% for the Schedule caste candidates. He submits that the broad category of Scheduled Caste includes the candidates belonging to Vimukt Jatis and Bazigars, who are very much a part of the Scheduled Castes as they fall in the 'other category' as per the provision of the 2006 Act. He submits that an additional reservation/opportunity/benefit is sought to be given in case the posts remain unfilled in the quota reserved for the Balmikis/ Mazhbis/ Scheduled Castes Ex-serviceman and Scheduled Castes sportsman. He submits that the reservation provided under the policy instructions dated 20.12.2001 is dependent upon an eventuality which may or may not happen in a particular selection and such reservation is not in addition to what has already been reserved for the Scheduled Caste. The intention of the Government was not to carve out and make separate reservation to the extent of 2% of the posts, out of the posts reserved for the Scheduled Castes, particularly when the candidates belonging to Vimukt Jatis and Bazigars are already enlisted as Scheduled Castes as per the list published by the President of India in exercise of the powers under Article 341 of the Constitution of India and fall in the sub category -'Others'.

11. In the considered opinion of the Court, the answer of the aforesaid question is clear and simple. However, before answering it, it would be appropriate to notice certain precedents on the issue relied

upon by the parties. The attention of the Court has been drawn to the judgment passed by a Co-ordinate Bench in '**Buta Ram Azad and others vs. Union of India and another**' AIR 1983(P&H) 203 in which the history of persons belonging to the Vimukt Jatis and Bazigars was traced. After examining the old documents and the record, it was found that Vimukt Jatis were earlier known as the criminal tribes during the British regime and an Act was also passed, by the then British regime, known as Criminal Tribes Act, 1911, which was subsequently amended in the year 1974 and certain tribes were declared as criminal tribes under the said amended Act. In that writ petition, it was claimed that the ancestors of the persons belonging to Vimukt Jatis were in fact Rajputs who migrated from Mewar to the different parts of the country in the 16th century and thus, acquired the nomadic character. Because these tribes did not cooperate with the British regime and bore a nomadic character, they became educationally and economically backward.

12. The learned counsel representing the petitioners vehemently relies upon the judgment passed in '**Pavitar Singh and another vs. State of Punjab and others**' CWP-13983-2012 decided on 29.10.2016. On a careful reading of the aforesaid judgment, it is evident that the writ petition was allowed merely on the basis of the stand taken by the Government in the review applications. The Court directed that quota of 2% for Vimukt Jatis and Bazigars is against the total vacant posts. The learned counsel representing the parties are ad

idem that the correctness of aforesaid judgment is pending for reconsideration in appeal before the Letters Patent Bench. The attention of the Court has also been drawn to the judgment passed in **Navpreet Kumar vs. State of Punjab and others'** CWP-20605-2012 decided on 23.02.2017. The aforesaid judgment is given in the peculiar facts of the case and the Court did not examine the instructions issued on 20.12.2001. Next, the reliance is placed on the judgment passed in **Kamlesh Kumari vs. State of Punjab and another'** CWP-16903-2014 decided on 08.05.2018. In the aforesaid writ petition, the petitioner claimed that in the light of the instructions dated 20.12.2001, the State was required to separately reserve 2% of the posts for Vimukt Jatis and Bazigars. The writ petition was dismissed by the Court on the ground that the petitioner had failed to establish that the recruitment made under the project of Sarv Sikhsha Abhiyan Authority, Punjab, shall also be governed by the instructions dated 20.12.2001. Similarly, in '**Bhupinder Singh vs. State of Punjab'** 2015 (4) PLR 703 the High Court was considering the validity of election of the respondent no.6 to the office of Sarpanch. The writ petition was allowed on the basis of the stand taken by respondent no.4 and 5. In that judgment also, the instructions issued on 20.12.2001 were neither noticed nor they were the subject matter of interpretation. Similarly, in **Sahil Aggarwal vs. State of Punjab and others'** 2014 (3) SCT 813 the instructions issued by the State on 20.12.2001 were not the subject matter of interpretation.

13. Now, the stage is set to analyse the arguments of the learned counsel representing the petitioners.

14. The first argument is with respect to the retrospective operation of the instructions issued on 15.09.2022 while withdrawing the clarification dated 18.12.2020. It may be noted here that the basic instructions were issued way back on 20.12.2001. The clarification dated 18.12.2020 was issued on the basis of wrong and incorrect interpretation of the instructions dated 20.07.2001. By clarification dated 18.12.2020, the instructions dated 20.12.2001 were never superseded. Hence, there is no substance in the argument of the learned counsel that the instructions dated 15.09.2022 cannot operate with retrospective effect. In fact, by virtue of instructions dated 15.09.2022, the instructions dated 20.12.2001 continued to operate for the entire period while removing the effect of the instructions dated 18.12.2020 as reiterated by the learned counsel representing the State.

15. The second argument of the learned counsel is with regard to the stand taken by the State in the affidavit. It may be noted here that under Article 162 of the Constitution of India, the State has the power to issue instructions in the exercise of its executive powers with respect to the matter upon which the Legislature of the State has power to make laws subject to the proviso contained in Article 162. Moreover, the affidavit sworn in by the Officer of the State is not in the nature of instructions or law. Once the affidavit is contrary to what is clear and

categorically provided in the instructions, then, the State is not estopped from withdrawing the clarification issued on 18.12.2020.

16. The next argument of the learned counsel is on the binding effect of the judicial precedents. This Court has already analyzed the judgments relied upon by the learned counsel representing the parties. With highest respect, the aforesaid judgments are decision of the Courts in the peculiar facts of the case and there is no declaration of law, which is binding on the Court. It may be noted here that unless there is a declaration of law, the decision, in a previous case, is not a binding precedent, though it is binding between the parties to that case.

17. The next argument of the learned counsel is that reservation is a beneficial piece of legislation and hence, the relevant provisions should be harmoniously construed. It may be noted here that the doctrine of harmonious construction comes into operation only when there is a conflict between the two sets of instructions. Thus, the issue framed hereinbefore is satisfactorily answered and it is held that the crystal clear policy instructions shall prevail over the contradictory stands taken by the Government officials, in the peculiar facts of individual cases.

18. The argument of Sh.Puneet Gupta, Advocate, also does not has substance because the State while issuing instructions on 20.12.2001 has categorically provided that the additional reservation upto 2% for Vimukt Jatis and Bazigars will come into operation only if the posts are left unfilled in the quota reserved for Balmikis and

Mazhbis, Scheduled Caste Ex-serviceman and Scheduled Caste sportsman. Hence, 2% reservations for the Vimukt Jatis and Bazigars cannot be read in a manner as suggested by the counsel as the instructions are neither in addition to the reservation for the Scheduled Caste nor create any sub-category apart from the four categories noticed above. Once the learned counsel representing the petitioners do not dispute that Vimukt Jatis and Bazigars falls within the sub category 'others' of the broad category of Scheduled Caste, then, there is no occasion for the Court to hold that the State intended to provide separate reservation to the extent of 2% from the total posts advertised. In fact, this will come into operation only on the happening of an eventuality. The candidates belonging to Vimukt Jatis and Bazigars are entitled to be considered amongst the Scheduled Caste (Ramdasias and Others). Thereafter, if the posts are left unfilled in the quota reserved for Balmikis and Mazhbis, Scheduled Ex-serviceman and Scheduled Caste Sportsman, then, they are entitled to be considered in that category. This 2% of unfilled quota is restricted to the quota reserved for Balmikis, Mazhbis, Scheduled Ex-serviceman and Scheduled Caste Sportsman. This provision is in fact, in the nature of an effort of the State to grant representation to the Vimukt Jatis and Bazigars.

19. Now, let us examine the individual cases. In CWP-13956-2017 (titled as Satnam Singh vs. State of Punjab and others), the petitioner prays for a writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents to

consider and appoint the petitioner against one of the post remaining unfilled in the category of Balmikis and Mazhbis Sikhs, Scheduled Ex-serviceman and Scheduled Caste Sportsman. Keeping in view the forgoing discussion and interpretation, the State is directed to take steps in accordance with law.

20. In CWP-8833-2013 (titled as Agya Pal and another vs. State of Punjab and others), the petitioners pray for quashing the appointment of respondent no.4 to 6 as Medical Officers (Dental) in the Scheduled Caste (M&B) category. The petitioners claim that there is 2% reservation of the total posts for Vimukt Jatis and Bazigars candidates, which is not the correct position. Hence, there is no substance in this writ petition.

21. In CWP-8124-2013 (titled as Ravinder Kumar vs. State of Punjab and others), the petitioner claims appointment on the post of Vaid on the basis of reservation for Vimukt Jatis. The respondents shall proceed, if so advised, in accordance with the interpretation made hereinbefore.

22. In CWP-15622-2017 (titled as Dr. Sukhjiwan Singh vs. State of Punjab and another), the dispute is with regard to an appointment under the recruitment notice dated 31.08.2016, for 117 posts of Veterinary Officers in the Department of Animal Husbandry, Punjab. The Punjab Public Service Commission has informed the petitioner that the matter regarding filling up of vacant seats of Veterinary Officers from the candidates belonging to Vimukt Jatis is to

decided by the Department at its own level. The Department is required to take steps in accordance with the interpretation in this judgment. However, there is no provision for creating another sub category of Vimukt Jatis and Bazigars to entitle them for 2% reservation, separately.

23. In CWP-2756-2016 (titled as Jagtar Singh and another vs. State of Punjab and others), the recruitment notice was issued on 20.11.2010. The petitioners claim that they are entitled to 2% reservation on the advertised posts for the Vimukt Jatis. Their claim was rejected by the competent authority which is in consonance with the intent of the instructions issued on 20.12.2001. Hence, there is no substance in this argument.

24. In CWP-25569-2012 (titled as Meenakshi vs. State of Punjab and another), 114 posts of the Medical Officers (Dental) were sought to be filled in through the recruitment notice dated 26.07.2011. It is claimed that two vacancies of Mazhbis and Balmikis remain unfilled whereas two posts of the Scheduled Caste Exserviceman, (Mazhbis and Balmiki) and one post of Scheduled Caste Sportsman (Mazhbis and Balmiki) remain unfilled. After the receipt of the copy of this judgment, the Government is requested/directed to take a call on the aforesaid aspect.

25. In CWP No. 7436-2020 (titled as Rakesh Kumar vs. State of Punjab and others) the petitioner claims that the candidates belonging to the Vimukt Jatis have not been called for scrutiny of the

documents for the purpose of completing the recruitment process. In substance, the petitioner claims that he belongs to Vimukt Jatis and is entitled to be considered against 2% quota of the total advertised seats, which is not the correct position in view of the preceding discussion. Hence, there is no substance in this writ petition. Hence, dismissed.

26. In CWP No. 16588-2014 (titled as ‘Gurpreet Singh Chauhan vs. State of Punjab and others’) the petitioner prays for issuance of a writ in the nature of Mandamus to the Government to strictly comply with the instructions issued on 28th December, 2001, 22nd July, 2008 and 25th March, 2011. He belongs to the Vimukt Jatis. The dispute is with regard to the recruitment pursuant to the recruitment notice inviting applications for 80 posts of Assistant District Attorneys. The official respondents shall take a call on the requirement to take further steps to complete the selection in view of the judgment passed by this Court. Hence, disposed of.

27. In CWP No. 23718 of 2017 (titled as ‘Gagandeep Singh vs.State of Punjab and others’) the petitioner prays for issuance of a writ in the nature of Mandamus to direct the respondents to consider and appoint him as Junior Engineer (Electrical) against the reserved category seat for Vimukt Jatis and Balmikis. In substance, the petitioner claims that he is entitled to be appointed on account of the reservation of 2 % of the total advertised posts. In view of the foregoing interpretation, there is no substance in this writ petition. Hence, dismissed.

28. In CWP No. 12651 of 2018 (titled as ‘Harshdeep Kaur vs. State of Punjab and others) the petitioner claims that her candidature for selection and appointment as Staff Nurse against one post under 2 % reservation quota for Vimukt Jatis out of 60 posts left unfilled in the quota reserved for Balmikis, Mazhbis, Scheduled Caste (Ex-serviceman) and Scheduled Caste (Sportsman) should be considered. This Court has already interpreted the instructions and the official respondents shall proceed in the matter accordingly. Disposed of.

29. In CWP No. 33335 of 2019 (titled as ‘Jaswinder Singh vs. State of Punjab and others) the petitioner prays for the issuance of a writ of Certiorari to quash the impugned order of the respondents declining to consider his candidature for selection and appointment as Principal in the Department of Education, Punjab against one post falling under 2% reservation quota for Vimukt Jatis. The petitioner claims that out of 154 advertised posts of Principal, 2% reservation for Vimukt Jatis is required to be calculated on the total number of the posts advertised. In view of the foregoing interpretation, there is no substance in this writ petition. Hence, dismissed.

30. In CWP No. 16071-2021 (titled as ‘Kulwinder Singh vs. State of Punjab and others’) The petitioner claims that there is 2% reservation quota for Vimukt Jatis out of the total advertised posts. In view of the foregoing discussion, there is no substance in this writ petition. Hence, dismissed.

31. In CWP No. 11284 of 2016 (titled as ‘Rashpinder Kumar vs. State of Punjab and others’) the petitioner claims that the instructions dated 28th December, 2001 are self-defeating, illusory and incapable of being implemented. Hence, the aforesaid instructions should be quashed. The learned counsel representing the petitioner did not come forward to explain the reasons for which the instructions are liable to be quashed. Hence, no further order is required to be passed by this Court.

32. In CWP No. 19033 of 2017 (titled as ‘Sahil vs. State of Punjab and another’) the petitioner claims that because he belongs to the Vimukt Jatis, hence, entitled to be issued an order of appointment. The Public Service Commission shall take a call on the claim of the petitioner in accordance with the foregoing interpretation of the instructions. Disposed of.

33. In CWP No. 21986-2017 (titled as ‘Jasvinder Kumar vs. State of Punjab and another’) the petitioner prays for a direction to the respondents to issue appointment letter in view of the instructions dated 28th December, 2001. The appointing authority shall take a call on the basis of the instructions issued on 28th December, 2001 as discussed hereinbefore by this Court. Disposed of.

34. In CWP No. 1441 of 2023 (titled as ‘Harmander Singh and others vs. State of Punjab and others’) the petitioners pray for quashing of the selection list issued on 16th December, 2022. In substance, the petitioners pray for direction to the respondents to make appointments

of the candidates belonging to Vimukt Jatis and Balmiki against 2 % quota seats of the total advertised posts. In view of the foregoing interpretation, there is no substance in this case. Hence, dismissed.

35. In CWP No. 13133-2012 (titled as ‘Sawan Pal and others vs. State of Punjab and others’) the petitioners claim that as per the instructions dated 28 December, 2001, 2% of the total advertised posts are required to be filled up from amongst the unfilled posts in the category of Balmikis, Mazhbis, Scheduled Caste (Ex servicemen) and Scheduled Caste (Sportsman) which is not in consonance with the foregoing interpretation. The official respondents shall take a call in the matter. Disposed of.

36 . In CWP No. 15716 of 2017 (titled as ‘Kulwinder Singh vs. State of Punjab and another’) the petitioner seeks direction to the respondents to appoint him as Revenue Patwari as he belongs to the Vimukt Jatis. The competent authority shall take a call in view of the foregoing interpretation. Disposed of.

37. In CWP No. 22143-2022 (titled as ‘Jagtar Singh vs. Director General of Police and another’) the petitioner prays for issuance of a direction to consider the candidature of the petitioner for appointment to the post of District Police Constable and Armed Police Constable under the Scheduled Caste (R&O) and Vimukt Jatis category by giving 2% reservation against the total number of advertised posts. In view of the foregoing interpretation, there is no substance in this writ petition. Hence, dismissed.

38. In CWP-11951 of 2018 (titled as ‘Jagdish Singh vs. State of Punjab and another’), the petitioner claims appointment by giving 2% reservation for Vimukt Jatis against the total number of advertised posts. In view of the foregoing interpretation, there is no substance in this writ petition. Hence, dismissed.

39. In CWP-21662-2013 (titled as ‘Kulwinder Kumar vs. State of Punjab and others’) the petitioner prays for quashing the instructions issued on 20th December 2001 on the ground that they are self-defeating, illusory and incapable of being implemented. In view of the foregoing interpretation of the instructions, there is no substance in the writ petition. Hence, dismissed.

40. In CWP-21949-2017 (titled as ‘Lal Singh vs. State of Punjab and others’) the petitioner claims that he is entitled to be considered for appointment as Assistant against the vacant post. The petitioner claims that the 2% reservation meant for Vimukt Jatis is post based and not vacancy based. The aforesaid interpretation is without substance in view of the foregoing discussion. Hence, dismissed.

41. Keeping in view the aforesaid discussion, the writ petitions are disposed of accordingly.

42. All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, are also Disposed of.

23.03.2023
rekha
Whether speaking/reasoned :
Whether reportable :

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE
Yes/No
Yes/No

SR. NO.	CASE NO.	PARTIES NAME
1.	CWP-8833-2013	Agya Pal and another vs. State of Punjab and others
2.	CWP-15716-2017	Kulwinder Singh vs. State of Punjab and another
3.	CWP-21949-2017	Lal Singh vs. State of Punjab and others
4.	CWP-21662-2013	Kulwinder Kumar vs. State of Punjab and others
5.	CWP-11284-2016	Rashpinder Kumar vs. State of Punjab and others
6.	CWP-11951-2018	Jagdish Singh vs. Director General of Police and another
7.	CWP-22143-2022	Jagtar Singh vs. Director General of Police and another
8.	CWP-13133-2012	Sawan Pal and others vs. State of Punjab and others
9.	CWP-19033-2017	Sahil vs. State of Punjab and another
10.	CWP-8124-2013	Ravinder Kumar vs. State of Punjab and others
11.	CWP-13956-2017	Satnam Singh vs. State of Punjab and others
12.	CWP-25569-2012	Meenakshi vs. State of Punjab and another
13.	CWP-2756-2016	Jagtar Singh and another vs. State of Punjab and others
14.	CWP-23718-2017	Gagandeep Singh vs. State of Punjab and others
15.	CWP-21986-2017	Jasvinder Kumar vs. State of Punjab and another
16.	CWP-1441-2023	Harmander Singh and others vs. State of Punjab and others
17.	CWP-12651-2018	Harshdeep Kaur vs. State of Punjab and others
18.	CWP-16071-2021	Kulwinder Singh vs. State of Punjab and others
19.	CWP-33335-2019	Jaswinder Singh vs. State of Punjab and others
20.	CWP-7436-2020	Rakesh Kumar vs. State of Punjab and others
21.	CWP-15622-2017	Dr. Sukhjiwan Singh vs. State of Punjab and another
22.	CWP-16588-2014	Gurpreet Singh Chauhan vs. State of Punjab and others

23.03.2023
rekha

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE