



CWP-725-2014

-1-

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

\*\*\*\*

203

CWP-725-2014

Date of Decision: 28.08.2025

KULWANT SINGH

...Petitioner

Vs.

STATE OF PUNAJB AND ORS.

...Respondents

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

Present:- Mr. Sumeet Mahajan, Sr. Advocate with  
Ms. Shruti Singla, Advocate and  
Mr. Shrey Sachdeva, Advocate  
for the petitioner

Mr. Aman Dhir, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab

\*\*\*

**JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)**

1. On 16.07.2015, following order was passed by this Court:-

*“Contends that the petitioner has rendered outstanding service on an anti-terrorist front. And in more than 17 FIRs, in relation to different terrorist cases, he had played a key role in numerous encounters in which dreaded extremists were killed and arrested. In the wake of the Government instructions, he had applied for out of turn promotion. His claim has primarily been rejected on the ground that he neither suffered any injury in anti terrorist operation nor lost any family member at the hand of the terrorist and thus his case was not covered within “rare deserving category”.*

*Learned senior counsel for the petitioner maintains that the petitioner never staked his claim for having either suffered an injury in anti-terrorist operation or for having*

**CWP-725-2014****-2-**

*lost a family member at the hands of terrorists. Rather in terms of the Government instructions that postulate; that the police officials whose anti terrorist work conspicuously stands out, are required to be recommended for an immediate service benefit commensurate with the good work done by them. Therefore, he submits that the reason assigned in support of the order that is being assailed is palpably erroneous and reflects complete non-application of mind.*

*Learned State counsel prays for a short accommodation to seek instructions or file a specific affidavit to respond.*

*Adjourned to 07.08.2015.”*

2. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner indubitably played active role on anti-terrorist front. For his outstanding service, he was entitled to service benefits as per Policy dated 29.11.2012.

3. Learned State counsel submits that petitioner concededly actively participated on anti-terrorist front. He played role in 15 FIRs. He was considered and granted local rank of ASI w.e.f. 05.11.1990. He was reverted to his substantive rank of Head Constable on 31.03.1991 and thereafter, granted regular promotion as ASI on 28.10.1991. He was again out of turn promoted as ad hoc Sub-Inspector w.e.f. 04.09.1992. He was reverted to his substantive rank in compliance of order dated 11.01.2000 passed by this Court in *CWP-1815-1999*. He was reverted from the rank of Sub-Inspector on 28.04.2000 and granted ORP of Sub Inspector. He was granted regular promotion as Sub-Inspector on

**CWP-725-2014****-3-**

29.09.2006. In this way, he was initially granted out of turn promotion as Assistant Sub-Inspector and thereafter Sub-Inspector. From September' 1992 to September' 2006 he worked as Sub Inspector either ad hoc or ORP. As per Policy of 2012, he was entitled to grant of higher local rank or next higher rank without any gain in the seniority. He was considered for promotion with seniority, however, committee did not find his case appropriate. He was considered for promotion as per judgments of this Court in *"SI Pardeep Singh and Ors. Vs. State of Punjab and Ors."* *CWP-4829-2011 dated 16.12.2014 and Darshan Singh Vs. The State of Haryana and Ors. CWP-10616-1997 dated 29.09.1997.* The petitioner was promoted as DSP w.e.f. 30.06.2012, though he retired as Inspector on 31.12.2015. He was given notional promotion which entailed higher pension.

4. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner expressed his inability to controvert aforesaid factual position.

5. This Courts finds that as per Policy petitioner was primarily entitled to promotion on ad hoc or local rank basis. His work was duly recognized/appreciated by granting ad hoc/local rank of Assistant Sub-Inspector and Sub-Inspector. He has further been retrospectively promoted as DSP.

6. In the wake of afore-stated facts, no further order is warranted.

7. Disposed of.



**CWP-725-2014**

-4-

8. Pending application(s), if any stands disposed of.

**(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)**  
**JUDGE**

**28.08.2025**  
*Deepak DPA*

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