

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the said direction has already been given by this Court in *Satpal Singh and ors. (supra)*, wherein it has been mentioned that only the petitioners who are eligible should be granted the benefit and not otherwise.

Keeping in view above, learned counsel for the respondent-State submits that liberty be given that in case, any of the petitioners is found to be not eligible and are not entitled for the benefit, the liberty be given to State to pass appropriate speaking order to deny the said benefit.

It goes without saying that in case any of the petitioners does not fulfil the requisite qualification for appointment to the post in question, he/she will not be entitled for the benefit as directed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in case titled as "*State of Punjab and ors. Vs. Jagjit Singh and ors.*", 2016(4), SCT 641 hence, the present petition is disposed of in terms of *Satpal Singh and ors. (supra)*, with the clarification that in case any of the petitioners, in the present petition or even in *Satpal Singh and ors. (supra)*, or any other connected case decided on the basis of *Satpal Singh and ors. (supra)*, does not fulfil the requisite qualification, the liberty is with the Department to pass appropriate order denying the benefit by giving due reasons.

Present petition is disposed of in terms of *Satpal Singh and ors. (supra)*, with the abovesaid liberty.

Pending application, if any, also stands disposed of.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

20-09-2024
Sapna Goyal

NOTE: Whether speaking : YES/NO
Whether reportable: YES/NO