



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

CWP-22543-2015

Date of Decision: 03.09.2025

Virender Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and Others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. Nikhil Lather, Advocate for
Mr. Anurag Goyal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ashok Kumar Khubbar, 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 setting aside of notice dated 28.07.2015 (Annexure P-7) and order dated 25.09.2015 (Annexure P-9) whereby petitioner has been made to retire at the age of 55 years.

2. The petitioner joined Haryana Police Force as Constable on 06.02.1984. He was made to retire on attaining the age of 55 years. The impugned order was passed on 25.09.2015. It means the petitioner served respondent for more than 30 years.

3. The respondent by impugned notice/order has retired the petitioner on attaining the age of 55 years. The said order has been passed in exercise of power conferred by Rule 9.18 of Punjab Police Rules, 1934 (as applicable to State of Haryana) (in short 'PPR') read with Rule 5.32 of Punjab Civil Service Rules, Vol-II (as applicable to Haryana). The

impugned orders were passed on 25.09.2015. Had the impugned order not been passed, the petitioner would have worked for three more years. He was part of Haryana Police Force and his service was pensionable, thus, he must have received pension which is 50% of last drawn salary. He had not worked during said period.

4. At this stage, this Court does not find it appropriate to set aside notice and impugned order whereby petitioner was made to retire.

5. Accordingly, the instant petition is hereby dismissed.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

03.09.2025
Prince Chawla

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