



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

CWP-11680-2019

Date of Decision: 29.07.2025

Pushpa

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and Others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- None for the petitioner.

Mr. Shashank Bhandari, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking direction to respondent to appoint her against post reserved for Ex-servicemen.

2. On 05.09.2019, the following order was passed:

“Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that as per his calculation from OMR Sheet, he had secured 52.20 marks in the test held for filling up posts of Constable in category of Dependents of Freedom Fighters whereas the cut off marks is 28.

Notice of motion for 16.09.2019.

Mr. R.K. Doon, AAG, Haryana accepts notice for respondents. Counsel for petitioner is directed to supply requisite number of copies of complete paper book to counsel appearing for petitioner during course of day, if not supplied already.

Counsel for State is directed to bring result of the petitioner and cut off marks on next adjourned date.”

3. In continuation of said order, order dated 22.01.2020 was passed which is reproduced as below:

“In pursuance to this Court’s order dated 05.09.2019, the result of the petitioner who belongs to Dependent of Freedom Fighter category under the main category of ESM General has been produced in Court under sealed cover.

Result de-sealed in Court. Perused.

The grand total of the petitioner is 53 marks. However, learned State counsel submits that the candidates from Dependents of Freedom Fighter category would only be considered in case the ESM category candidate is not available.

Copy of the result returned back to the State counsel.

State counsel seeks time to file reply. May do so on or before the next date with advance copy to the counsel opposite.

Post again on 03.04.2020.”

- 4. From the reply, it comes out that as per advertisement, preference was given to Ex-Servicemen and dependents of Freedom Fighters were eligible in case vacancies had remained unutilized by Ex-servicemen. All the vacancies were utilized by Ex-servicemen, thus, no dependent was considered.
- 5. There is no representation on behalf of the petitioner. It appears that the petitioner is not interested in pursuing the matter.
- 6. Dismissed for non-prosecution.
- 7. The petitioner is at liberty to move an appropriate application within three months from today, if cause survives.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

29.07.2025
Prince Chawla

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