

CWP-13047-2024 and
other connected cases

2024:PHHC:166619



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

(315)	CWP-13047-2024 Date of Decision : 12.12.2024	
Lakhwinder Singh		...Petitioner
	Versus	
State of Punjab and another		...Respondents
(316)	CWP-13078-2024	
Jasvir Singh		...Petitioner
	Versus	
State of Punjab and another		...Respondents
(317)	CWP-13175-2024	
Jugraj Singh		...Petitioner
	Versus	
State of Punjab and another		...Respondents
(318)	CWP-13185-2024	
Dharminder Singh		...Petitioner
	Versus	
State of Punjab and another		...Respondents
(319)	CWP-13197-2024	
Kulwant Singh		...Petitioner



Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM: *HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI*

Present: Mr. Sukhdev Raj Kamboj, Advocate for the petitioner(s)
in all cases.

Mr. T.P.S. Chawla, Senior Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

Harsimran Singh Sethi J. (Oral)

1. By this common order, five writ petitions, the details of which have been given in the heading, are being decided as all petitions involve the same question of law on similar facts.
2. In the present bunch of petitions, the grievance being raised by the petitioners is that though they have been granted the benefit of seniority by taking deemed date of appointment from the year 2009 but they were entitled for the benefit of appointment from the year 2006 which has not been granted.
3. On being asked as to whether any junior of the petitioners has been given appointment prior to the date when the petitioners were given appointment, learned counsel for the petitioners did not submit any fact that anyone who was junior to the petitioners in the select list, was appointed prior to the date when the appointment has been given to the petitioners.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that he has instructions that certain candidates who were lower in merit than the petitioners were appointed prior to the year 2009, hence, the petitioners be



given liberty to approach the respondents by filing appropriate representation giving the details of the juniors, who were appointed prior to the date of appointment as has been given to the petitioners by the impugned order.

5. Learned State counsel submits that in case, any such representation is received at the hands of the petitioners, keeping in view the facts mentioned therein, said representation will be considered and an appropriate speaking order will be passed within a period of eight weeks and in case, it is found feasible that the date of appointment of the petitioners needs to be changed, the said benefit will be granted, otherwise due reasons will be mentioned in the speaking order for not accepting the claim of the petitioners and the same will be duly conveyed to the petitioners.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that in view of the statement of learned counsel for the respondents, the present petitions may kindly be disposed of having been not pressed any further with liberty to the petitioners to file appropriate representation.

7. Ordered accordingly.

8. Pending miscellaneous application, if any, also stands disposed of.

9. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of connected cases.

December 12, 2024
kanchan

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : No