



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

103

CWP-27352-2016 (O&M)
Date of decision: 02.07.2025

Jagmohan Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Maninder Arora, Advocate
for the applicant-petitioner.

Mr. Swapan Shorey, DAG, Punjab.

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (Oral)

CM-8739-CWP-2025

Having heard learned counsel for the parties and in view of the reasons stated in the application, the same is allowed and the main case is taken up on board today itself.

Main Case

1. Prayer made in the present petition is for quashing the final list dated 14.12.2016 under reserved category for the post of Khaddi master.
2. Vernacular of Advertisement No.7 dated 30.12.2015, Annexure P-2, when perused, reveals that in para 12 thereof, there was a specific mention of category code 102 for SC (M &B), while 103 for S.C (Ramdasia & others), as such the submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner that he was not aware of the same and that the post could not have been offered to the candidate belonging to code No.102 cannot be countenanced, particularly in view of para 4(5) of the Punjab Scheduled Castes & Backward Classes (Reservation in Services) Act, 2006, dated 05.10.2006,



Annexure R/1 appended with the reply dated 24.01.2018 by way of affidavit of Secretary, Subordinate Services Selection Board, Punjab-respondent No.1, whereby 50% of the vacancies of the quota reserved for scheduled castes in direct recruitment were to be offered to Balmikis and Mazhbi Sikhs, if available, as a first preference from amongst the scheduled castes. Admittedly, though, the above had not been challenged in this petition, however, validity thereof has been upheld by the Constitution Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Civil Appeal No.2317 of 2011 titled as **The State of Punjab and others vs. Davinder Singh and others**, decided on 01.08.2024, to await which the present petition had been adjourned *sine die* on 23.04.2024.

3. The petitioner, thus, could not be placed in the select list for appointment to the post in question and his learned counsel could neither refute the above position nor advance any other argument.

4. Petition dismissed.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

02.07.2025

Hemant

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes / No
Whether reportable	:	Yes / No