

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

138

CWP-2001-2024
Date of Decision: 31.01.2024

ASI Mukesh Kumar and others ...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present : Mr.B.S.Sidhu, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Inderpreet Singh Kang, AAG, Punjab.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioners through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of Constitution of India are seeking direction the respondents to count the service rendered by them on the post of SPOs as qualifying service.
2. Counsel for the petitioners submits that case of the petitioners is covered by judgment dated 06.09.1995 passed by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in **CWP- 812 of 1994 titled as ‘Balvinder Kumar and others vs. The State of Punjab and others’** (Annexure P-5) and judgment dated 12.12.1996 passed by a Division Bench of this Court in **CWP No. 7451 of 1996 titled as ‘Lal Mohd. and 25 others vs. State of Punjab’** as well as judgment dated 16.03.2023 passed by this Court in **CWP No. 5648 of 2017 titled as ‘Sukhmander Singh and others vs. State of Punjab and others’** (Annexure P-10). This Court while disposing of various writ petitions has noted judgment of this Court in **Harbans Lal vs. State of Punjab** passed in **CWP No. 2371 of 2010** and other judgments

have not been noticed. There are all possibilities that authorities while deciding representation of the petitioners may form an opinion other than formed in the case of other employees.

3. Notice of motion.
4. Mr. Inderpreet Singh Kang, AAG, Punjab, who on advance notice is present in Court, accepts notice and does not dispute prayer of the petitioners.
5. In the wake of reasons set out in the petition and statement of State counsel, the petition stands disposed of. The respondent authorities would consider judgments of this Court in **Balvinder Kumar(Supra)**, **Lal Mohd.(Supra)**, **Sukhmander Singh (Supra)** apart from judgment of this Court in **Harbans Lal (Supra)** while passing order on the representation of the petitioners.
6. In view of the above, petition stands disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

31.01.2024
anju

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>No</i>