



CWP-19197-2014

-1-

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

202

CWP-19197-2014

Date of Decision: 11.08.2025

RANJIT SINGH AND ORS.

...Petitioners

Vs.

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

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

Mr. Aman Dhir, DAG Punjab

Mr. D.S. Patwalia, Sr. Advocate with
Ms. Rishu Bajaj, Advocate
for respondents No.4, 5, 7 to 12

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioners through instant petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India are seeking direction to respondent to recompute the merit list of Backward Class Category and revise the result.

2. The petitioners pursuant to advertisement dated 11.09.2010 applied for the post of Constable. They applied under BC Category. The respondent declared result wherein candidates belonging to Reserved Category and having more marks than candidates selected under General Category were kept in their own category i.e. Reserved Category. Resultantly, many Reserved Category candidates could not be selected.



CWP-19197-2014

-2-

This led to instant petition.

3. During the pendency of instant petition, the respondent revised result and found that there are 33 candidates belonging to SC/BC Categories who have scored more than the candidates selected under General Category. These candidates were shifted to General Category and show cause notice was issued to 27 candidates belonging to General Category. The aforesaid 27 candidates approached this Court by way of CWP-6254-2017 assailing show cause notices. This Court vide order dated 24.03.2017 while issuing notice of motion ordered to maintain *status quo*. The said petition is still pending and 27 candidates who are over and above the advertised posts are still working with respondent.

4. From the perusal of reply, it is evident that out of 9 petitioners 6 have already been selected on account of revision of result. Three are not selected because their names do not figure in select list despite revision of result.

5. The respondent has revised the result and done the needful. Thus, no further order is warranted.

6. Disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

11.08.2025

Deepak DPA

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