



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

215

CWP-25984-2019

Date of decision : 02.12.2024

Inderjit Kaur

....Petitioner

V/S

Punjab State Planning Board and others

....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAMIT KUMAR

Present: Mr. Sandeep Kumar, Advocate for
Mr. D.S. Rawat, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Surya Kumar, A.A.G., Punjab.

NAMIT KUMAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner has filed the instant writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking the following reliefs :-

*(i) Issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to issue seniority list of Senior Assistant, by applying the principle that **"roster points are not seniority points and therefore, seniority cannot be fixed on the basis of roster point appointments"** and by applying the principle of **"Catch up"**, i.e. by keeping in view the merit position of the petitioner at the time of selection to the induction post of Clerk in accordance with the instructions dated 22.10.1999 (P-2), 23.10.2000 (P-3) and 10.10.2014 (P-6) issued by the Govt. of Punjab and law settled by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case titled as **Ajit Singh Janjua & others Versus State of Punjab & others, 1999 (4) RSJ 211 (S.C.)** and **S. Paneer Selvam and others Vs. Government of Tamil Nadu and others, 2015 (4) RSJ 74 (SC)** and in accordance with the judgments passed by this Hon'ble Court in **R.L. Bhagat IPS Versus State of Punjab and others as reported in***



CWP-25984-2019

-2-

2010 (3) SLR 737, Prithpal Singh Vs. State of Punjab as reported in 2010 (2) RSJ 295 and Hari Singh Versus State of Punjab and others as reported in 2012 (3) SCT 355. (5)

(ii) Further issuance of a writ in the nature of Mandamus directing the respondents that after finalization of seniority list of Senior Assistants in accordance with instruction dated 10.10.2014 (P-6), the respondents should consider the case of the petitioner for further promotion to the post of Planning Officer with all consequential benefits.

(6) Any other appropriate writ, order, or direction may also be issued which this Hon'ble Court may deem just and proper under the peculiar facts and circumstances of the present case.”

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that since the petitioner has retired from service on attaining the age of superannuation on 31.05.2023, therefore, the claim raised in the present petition has been rendered infructuous.

3. Disposed of as having become infructuous.

02.12.2024*kothiyal***(NAMIT KUMAR)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes/No

Whether Reportable:

Yes/No