



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

\*\*\*\*

**CWP-5717-2014**

**Date of Decision: 13.08.2025**

Ram Bhaj

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and Others

...Respondents

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL**

Present:- Mr. Vijay Pal, 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 setting aside of order dated 06.01.2014 (Annexure P-13) passed by the Inspector General of Police, Rohtak Range, Rohtak whereby the representation of the petitioner dated 04.12.2010 (Annexure P-11) addressed to the Director General of Police (**DGP**) has been rejected being not covered by the policy framed by the Government of Haryana dated 21.11.2013 (Annexure P-12) for regularization of *ad hoc* promotion of police personnel made prior to 1999.

2. The petitioner was a part of Haryana Police Force. He retired on attaining the age of superannuation on 31.03.2013. He was adorned with rank of Assistant Sub Inspector (**ASI**) (*ad hoc*) w.e.f. 08.03.1989 on account of his contribution in collecting inputs against terrorists. He was given substantive rank of ASI on 19.09.1999. In other words, he acted as ASI (*ad hoc*) from 1989 to 1999. The said period was not regularized.

The petitioner requested respondent to regularize his *ad hoc* service. The respondent vide order dated 09.05.2003 regularized his *ad hoc* promotion. The order dated 09.05.2003 was withdrawn vide order dated 29.12.2005. Many officials with respect to their *ad hoc* service made representation to Government which framed policy dated 19.11.2013. Case of petitioner was considered as per policy of 19.11.2013. His claim was rejected on the ground that his act and conduct does not fall within definition of bravery as contemplated by policy of 2013. He preferred ***CWP No.5717 of 2014*** before this Court which was disposed of vide order dated 26.03.2014. He preferred Intra Court Appeal which came to be allowed by way of remand vide order dated 26.04.2016.

3. Learned counsel for the parties are *ad idem* that policy dated 19.11.2013 stands superseded by policy dated 10.08.2016. As per policy dated 10.08.2016, *ad hoc* promotion cannot be regularized if it is beyond ceiling of 10% as contemplated by Punjab Police Rules, 1934 (as applicable to State of Haryana) (in short ‘PPR’).

4. As policy of 2013 which was foundation of instant petition stands withdrawn and new policy has come into force, this Court finds it appropriate to direct the respondent to reconsider claim of petitioner in the light of policy of 2016. Let the needful be done within four months from today.

5. ***Disposed of.***

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)  
JUDGE

13.08.2025  
*Prince Chawla*

|                           |        |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Whether Speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| Whether Reportable        | Yes/No |