



133

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CWP-20707-2024**Date of Decision: 27.08.2024****SATNAM SINGH AND ORS**

..... Petitioners

*Versus***STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS**

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present : Mr. Yagsimant Attri, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Aman Dhir, DAG, Punjab.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioners through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India are seeking direction to the respondents to issue them appointment letters for the post of Constable in Punjab Armed Police.

2. The petitioners, pursuant to advertisement of 1993 applied for the post of Constable. The respondents had advertised 5159 vacancies. The respondents as per their wisdom decided to fill up substantial posts from Special Police Officers (SPOs). The petitioners, despite vacancies were not appointed.

3. A litigation ensued between candidates and State of Punjab. Multiple petitions came to be filed before this Court. CWP-16191-1997 along with other petitions was disposed of vide judgment dated 23.12.2016. The writ petition was allowed with a direction to the State to consider the petitioners therein for appointment against 159 vacant posts.

The State preferred Intra Court Appeal against the aforesaid order. LPA-



737-2017 filed by State came to be dismissed vide order dated 31.10.2018 passed by a Division Bench of this Court. The State did not stop here and dragged the litigation to Supreme Court. SLP filed by State has also been dismissed by Supreme Court on 23.02.2024.

4. Learned Counsel for the petitioners claims that petitioners’ name figured in the list of eligible candidates still they were not appointed. The vacancies are available, thus, they need to be considered like others who have been considered in 2017 or 2021. Many candidates who were lower in merit have been appointed during last 3-4 years.

5. Mr. Aman Dhir, DAG, Punjab submits that candidates who have been selected during last 3-4 years against vacancies advertised in 1993, were initially selected and had worked with respondent for a few years. The petitioners cannot claim parity with them.

6. The petitioners are claiming appointment against the posts which were advertised in 1993. The instant petition stands disposed of with liberty to petitioners to approach Authorities on the ground of parity. If they file representation within 1 month from today, this Court is sanguine of the fact that the Competent Authority would look into their grievance and pass appropriate order within 6 months from today.

7. Disposed of accordingly.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

27.08.2024
Ali

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