



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

**CWP-1211-2002 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 28.08.2025**

Mahender Singh and Another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and Others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. Yesh Paul Malik, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Suneel Ranga, DAG, Haryana.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioners through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India are seeking setting aside of order dated 27.04.2001 whereby respondent has rejected their claim for promotion from the date their juniors have been promoted.

2. From the perusal of record, it is evident that petitioners were seniors to private respondents prior to 1984. The petitioners were promoted as Assistant Sub Inspector (**ASI**) vide order dated 27.12.1984 in Karnal District (Ambala Range) and were transferred to Jind District where they joined on 13.01.1984. The private respondents were promoted as ASI in District Karnal (Ambala Range) w.e.f. 23.06.1986 and 22.10.1985 respectively. On 01.11.1989, Ambala Range was bifurcated. District Jind was assigned to Hisar Range and District Karnal was assigned to Rohtak Range. The petitioners remained in Hisar Range and private respondents became part of Rohtak Range. The petitioners and

private respondents were confirmed as ASI on 31.01.1990.

3. Mr. Yesh Paul Malik, Advocate submits that petitioners despite being seniors to private respondents were promoted as Inspector on a later date. The act of respondent was discriminatory and violative of principle of seniority.

4. From the perusal of record, it is evident that petitioners became part of Hisar Range after bifurcation of Ambala Range. The private respondents became part of Rohtak Range. The private respondents were concededly junior to petitioners in the Ambala Range, however, seniority of ASI had to be maintained at Range level. It was not to be maintained at District level. As private respondents became part of Rohtak Range, they got promotion as per their seniority in Rohtak Range. The petitioners were part of Hisar Range and they got promotion as per their seniority in Hisar Range.

5. On account of aforesaid fact, the petitioners were promoted at a later date than private respondents. The petitioners retired in 2006-2007.

6. In the backdrop, this Court does not find any infirmity in order dated 27.04.2001. The present petition deserves to be dismissed and is accordingly dismissed.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

28.08.2025
Prince Chawla

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