



**1022 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**CWP-17609-2018 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 10.11.2025**

Baljeet Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and Others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. Aditya Yadav, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ravi Partap Singh, DAG, Haryana.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking direction to respondent to promote him from the date his juniors were promoted as Inspector.

2. The petitioner joined Haryana Police Force on 29.03.1979. He cleared lower school course in September' 1988. He was promoted as Head Constable (HC) on 01.08.1989. He passed intermediate school course in July' 2003. He was promoted as Assistant Sub Inspector (ASI) on 12.09.2003. He passed upper school course on 09.11.2010. He was promoted as Sub Inspector (SI) on 30.11.2012. He retired as SI on 31.03.2017.

3. Rajinder Parshad joined service as Constable on 23.01.1984. Rajinder Parshad was promoted as Assistant Sub Inspector (ASI) on 05.02.2004. He was promoted as SI on 30.11.2012 i.e. the date on which petitioner was promoted as SI. As per seniority list dated 15.03.2017,

petitioner was always senior to Rajinder Parshad. There was another official namely Suresh Kumar who was also junior to petitioner like Rajinder Parshad. Rajinder Parshad and Suresh Kumar approached this Court by way of **CWP No.9002 of 2014** which was allowed vide order dated 21.04.2016. The respondents were directed to promote petitioner as SI w.e.f. 27.12.2010. They were promoted as SI w.e.f. 27.12.2010 and further promoted as Inspector w.e.f. 28.05.2016 vide order dated 16.10.2017. The petitioner claims that he was always senior to Rajinder Parshad and Suresh Kumar. He was senior to them as Constable, Head Constable, Assistant Sub Inspector and Sub Inspector, thus, there was no reason to promote them as Inspector and ignore him.

4. Learned State counsel on being confronted with seniority list dated 15.03.2017 expressed his inability to controvert the fact that petitioner was always senior to Rajinder Parshad and Suresh Kumar, however, he submits that in 2010 petitioner was facing departmental proceedings which were dropped by Superintendent of Police (SP), Railways, Ambala vide order dated 16.07.2010.

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

6. Indubitably, the petitioner was always senior to Rajinder Parshad and Suresh Kumar. The petitioner was subjected to departmental proceedings in 2009. The proceedings were dropped in July' 2010 and he was reinstated in February' 2010. He passed upper school course on 27.12.2010. He became eligible for the post of SI on 27.12.2010. His juniors were promoted as SI w.e.f. 27.12.2010, thus, he could also be promoted as SI w.e.f. 27.12.2010. The respondent while

implementing orders of this Court passed in *CWP No.9002 of 2014* were bound to consider status of petitioner because he was senior to Rajinder Parshad and Suresh Kumar. The respondent has promoted Rajinder Parshad and Suresh Kumar on 28.05.2016 and petitioner on the said date was in service and holding rank of SI. He deserves to be promoted as Inspector from 28.05.2016.

7. In the wake of above discussion and findings, the instant petition deserves to be allowed and accordingly ***allowed***. The respondents are hereby directed to promote petitioner as Inspector w.e.f. 28.05.2016. It is made clear that petitioner shall not be entitled to differential amount of pay/pension on actual basis, however, will be entitled on notional basis and accordingly his pension would be revised.

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

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

10.11.2025
Prince Chawla

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