

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

121

CWP-9723-2024
Date of Decision: 31.01.2024

BACHITTAR SINGH AND ORS ...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present : Mr.Nitesh Singla, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Aman Dhir, DAG, 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 for the purpose of seniority.
2. Counsel for the petitioners, *inter alia*, contends that case of the petitioners is covered by judgment dated 06.09.1995 passed by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in ***CWP No. 812 of 1994*** titled as '***Balvinder Kumar and others vs. The State of Punjab and others***' 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***'.
3. Mr. Aman Dhir, DAG, Punjab, who on advance notice is present in Court, submits that in terms of judgment of this Court in ***Balvinder Kumar (Supra), Lal Mohd. (Supra), Sukhmander Singh (Supra)***, the respondent

authorities in the case of various officials have considered their claim and passed orders. He further asserts that appropriate authority would consider case of the petitioner in terms of judgment of Division Bench of this Court in *Balvinder Kumar (Supra), Lal Mohd.(Supra), Sukhmander Singh (Supra)* and pass an appropriate order within 3 months from today.

4. In the wake of statements of both sides, the present petition stands disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

30.04.2024
anju

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