



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

CWP-12885-2022 (O&M)
Reserved on: 12.09.2025
Pronounced on: 22.09.2025

Manjit Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and Another

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. S.L. Chander Shekhar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Aman Dhir, DAG, Punjab.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J.

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking direction to respondent to reinstate him as Home Guard in Punjab Police with continuity of service and consequential benefits.

2. The petitioner's father was assassinated by terrorists in 1991. An FIR No. 06 dated 09.01.1991 registered under Sections 302, 34 IPC, Sections 25 and 54 of Arms Act, 1959 and Sections 3, 4 and 5 of TADA Act was registered in this regard at Police Station Jandiala. The petitioner was appointed as Guard in Punjab Home Guards in 1992. He worked as Member of Home Guard from April' 1993 to 2003. He received threat calls from terrorists, thus, he started hiding himself and his family members. His wife fell ill. She remained ill from 2003-2019. In 2022, he made a representation to respondents to reinstate him. The respondent has reinstated several similarly situated persons. The State Government has made policy for compassionate appointment of family

members of those Officers who have been killed by terrorists.

3. Learned counsel representing the petitioner submits that petitioner could not join service from 2003-2019 because of illness of his wife and threat by terrorists.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel submits that contention of petitioner is *prima facie* concocted and false. There was no terrorism during 2003-2019 in the State of Punjab. The petitioner as per his choice left job in 2003 and started filing representations in 2020 seeking reappointment.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record with their able assistance.

6. From the perusal of record, it is evident that petitioner was appointed as Member of Home Guard in 1992-1993. He worked till 2003. There was terrorism during 1991-1992, however, there was no terrorism in the State of Punjab after 1995. The petitioner worked till 2003. He as per his own choice left job. He has not placed on record any document disclosing that there was threat perception to him. Contention of the petitioner is wholly misconceived. He is also claiming illness of his wife from 2003-2019. He could be absent for few days or months on account of illness of his wife whereas he remained absent for 17 years. Post of Member of Home Guard is not a permanent post. It is a daily wage post. This Court, at this belated stage, cannot direct State Government to reengage the petitioner as a matter of right, however, authorities are at liberty to engage him as fresh member if he is found physically fit and complies with requisite terms and conditions.

7. In the wake of above discussion and findings, the instant petition stands *disposed of*.

8 Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

22.09.2025

Prince Chawla

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