



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

204-1

CWP-15278-2001

Date of Decision: 27.10.2025

RAM CHANDER

...Petitioner

Vs.

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. Rahil Mahajan, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. Ravi Partap Singh, DAG Haryana

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking setting aside of order dated 13.06.2001 whereby he was made to retire at the age of 55 years.

2. The respondent by impugned notice/order has retired the petitioner on attaining the age of 55 years. The said order has been passed in exercise of power conferred by Rule 9.18(1)(c) of Punjab Police Rules, 1934 (as applicable to State of Haryana) (in short 'PPR'). The impugned orders were passed in June' 2001. Had the impugned orders not been passed, the petitioner would have worked for three more years. He was part of Haryana Police Force and his service was pensionable, thus, he must have received pension which is 50% of last drawn salary. He had not worked during said period.

- 3. At this stage, this Court does not find it appropriate to set aside order whereby petitioner was made to retire.
- 4. Accordingly, the instant petition is hereby dismissed.
- 5. Pending application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

October 27, 2025
Deepak DPA

Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No