



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

202

CWP-1175-2017

Date of Decision: 07.11.2025

JANGIR SINGH

...Petitioner

Vs.

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS.

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. Pardeep Kumar, Advocate
for the petitioner

Mr. Puru Jarewal, DAG, Punjab

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking setting aside of show cause notice dated 19.12.2016 whereby he was called upon to show cause as to why he should not be dismissed from the post of Constable.

2. The petitioner pursuant to Advertisement applied for the post of Constable in 2010. He was selected. He joined Punjab Police Force (in short 'PAP') on 15.03.2011. The respondent vide advertisement dated 11.09.2010 invited applications for the post of Constable in District Police. The petitioner applied for the post through proper channel. He was discharged so that he may join District Police. He joined District Police. The respondent issued show cause notice dated 19.12.2016 calling upon him to show cause as to why he should not be dismissed

from service.

3. Learned State counsel submits that maximum marks to be awarded for height of 6 feet or above were 15 and petitioner by mistake was awarded 16 marks. His total score became 28 instead of 27. With the score of 27, he was not eligible for the post. It was mistake on the part of authorities and petitioner cannot take benefit of mistake of the authority.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record of the case.

5. It is undisputed that petitioner at the time of filing application for the post of Constable in District Cadre was working as Constable with PAP. He applied through proper channel and came to be selected. He was discharged by PAP and joined District Police. PAP and District Police are two different cadres of Punjab Police. The respondent by mistake granted him 16 marks for height instead of 15 marks. There was no misrepresentation or fraud or connivance on the part of petitioner. He was actually holding post of Constable in PAP. He is working with Police Force since 2011. On account of interim orders passed by this Court, he is still working with District Police. Had respondent rejected his claim at the first instance, he would have remained part of PAP. If at this stage, he is dismissed from District Police, he would not be able to join PAP. It would ruin his personal and family life without his fault.

6. In the backdrop, this Court does not find it appropriate to permit the respondent to discharge petitioner, at this belated stage,

especially when there was no lapse on his part and he was already working as Constable with PAP.

7. For the reasons assigned above, the instant petition deserves to be allowed accordingly allowed. Impugned show cause notice dated 19.12.2016 is hereby set aside.

8. Pending application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

November 07, 2025
Deepak DPA

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