

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH.

232

Date of Decision: 02.09.2024.

1. LPA-260-2023 (O&M)

Neeru Devi	Versus	...Appellant.
State of Punjab and others		Respondents.

2. LPA-304-2023 (O&M)

Garima Koundal	Versus	...Appellant.
State of Punjab and others		Respondents.

3. LPA-119-2023 (O&M)

Manjeet Kaur	Versus	...Appellant.
State of Punjab and another		Respondents.

4. LPA-120-2023 (O&M)

Kumari Upasna	Versus	...Appellant.
State of Punjab and another		Respondents.

5. LPA-139-2023 (O&M)

Ravinder Kaur	Versus	...Appellant.
State of Punjab and another		Respondents.

6. LPA-140-2023 (O&M)

Kulwinder Kaur	Versus	...Appellant.
State of Punjab and another		Respondents.

7. LPA-328-2023 (O&M)

Rukhsana	Versus	...Appellant.
State of Punjab and another		Respondents.

8. LPA-334-2023 (O&M)

Chanu Parcha

Versus

...Appellant.

State of Punjab and another

....Respondents.

9. LPA-455-2023 (O&M)

Jaspal Kaur

Versus

...Appellant.

State of Punjab and another

....Respondents.

10. LPA-121-2023 (O&M)

Meena Devi

Versus

...Appellant.

State of Punjab and another

....Respondents.

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE LISA GILL
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUKHVINDER KAUR**

Present: Mr. Deepak Aggarwal, Advocate
for the appellant (in LPA-260, 304, 119, 120, 139,
140, 455, 121-2023).

Ms. Promila Nain, Advocate and
Ms. Harveen Mehta, Advocate
for the appellant (in LPA-328 & 334-2023).

Mr. Rohit Ahuja, DAG, Punjab.

LISA GILL, J. (Oral)

1. This order shall dispose of all the aforesaid appeals i.e. LPA-260, 304, 119, 120, 139, 140, 328, 334, 455, 121-2023 as an identical question is involved for adjudication therein. Said appeals are taken up together at request and with consent of learned counsel for the parties.

2. Issue sought to be raised by the appellant(s)/ writ petitioner(s) in their respective writ petitions was whether a person entitled to benefit of

reservation in one State on migration to another State is entitled to said benefits from the State to which he/ she has migrated where the said category is also recognized as reserved. Issue regarding such entitlement of particularly female candidates who migrate to other states consequent to marriage was raised. It is not denied by learned counsel for appellants that the matter is indeed squarely covered against the appellant(s), in view of judgments of Hon'ble the Supreme Court in Marri Chandra Shekhar Rao Vs. The Dean, Seth G.S. Medical College and others, CWP No.989 of 1989 decided on 02.05.1990, Bir Singh Vs. Delhi Jal Board and others Civil Appeal No.1085 of 2013 decided on 30.08.2018, Ranjana Kumari Vs. State of uttrakhand, (2019) 12 SCC 664 and Bhadar Ram (D) through LRs Vs. Jassa Ram and others, Civil Appeal No.5933 of 2021, decided on 05.01.2022.

3. Learned counsel for appellant in unable to point out any illegality, infirmity or irregularity in the impugned order dated 09.01.2023, passed by learned Single Judge.

3. In view of the above, all above said appeals are dismissed.

4. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stands disposed of.

(LISA GILL)
JUDGE

(SUKHVINDER KAUR)
JUDGE

02.09.2024.

komal

Whether speaking/ reasoned	:	Yes/ No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/ No