

**CWP-7908-2006 &
connected cases.**

1

2025:PHHC:096423



101

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

CWP-7908-2006

Date of Decision: 31.07.2025

SANDEEP & ORS.

..... Petitioners

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA & ORS.

..... Respondents

2)

CWP-8624-2006

SUNIL KUMAR & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA & ANR.

....Respondents

3)

CWP-8802-2006

BHOOP SINGH AND ORS

.....Petitioners

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present : Mr. P.C.Kashyap, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Ms. Rajni Gupta, Addl. AG, Haryana.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)

1. By this common order, above noted writ petitions are hereby adjudicated as issues involved and prayer sought in all the petitions are common. With the consent of parties and for the sake of brevity, facts are



borrowed from CWP-7908-2006.

2. The petitioners through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India are seeking direction to respondent No.3 to place on record report of Central Bureau of Investigation which was prepared in pursuance to order dated 12.12.2005 (Annexure P-6) passed by this Court. They are further seeking setting aside of advertisement dated 03.05.2006 (Annexure P-6) and consequent selections. They are also seeking direction to restrain the respondent to fill up post of Constables in Haryana Police Force in pursuance to aforesaid advertisement.

3. On 29.05.2006, the following order was passed:

“In response to notice of motion, learned State counsel has placed on record a communication dated 29.5.2006 (Mark ‘A’) clarifying that the posts advertised vide Advertisement dated 3.5.2006 (P-6) are not the same posts for which the Division Bench of this Court, vide its order dated 27.10.2005 in C.W.P. No. 9695 of 2005, titled as Ajaib Singh and others v. State of Haryana, had directed holding of a CBI inquiry. It has further been pointed out that in case the petitioners, who belongs to HAP are found to be duly selected by the CBI authorities then the eligible petitioners would be considered for appointment in accordance with law. It has further been clarified that the petitioners have nothing to do with the present recruitment of Constables and on the basis of past recruitment they have no claim to these posts. This finishes one controversy with regard to inclusion of the posts of 2004 in the present advertisement.

However, Mr. D.S. Patwalia, learned counsel for the petitioners has argued that in the



advertisement, Constables who belongs to HSISF have been granted relaxation in age but similar benefit has been denied to the petitioners although they were selected in the same selection but were allocated to HAP. On the aforementioned controversy, the respondents are required to file reply.

Faced with this situation, learned State counsel requests for some time to file reply. Let reply be filed a week before the adjourned date with a copy in advance to the learned counsel for the petitioner. List again on 7.7.2006.”

- 4. Learned State counsel submits that petitioners are assailing advertisement of 2006. All the candidates against aforesaid advertisement stand selected. They have already joined service and working since 2007-2008.
- 5. Learned counsel for the petitioner expressed his inability to controvert aforesaid statement.
- 6. In the wake of statement of both sides, the present petitions have rendered infructuous.
- 7. Dismissed as having been rendered infructuous.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

31.07.2025
Ali

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No