



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

Date of Decision: 03.09.2025

1. CWP-7676-2016

Gurdeep Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and Others

...Respondents

2. CWP-186-2014

Nirmal Singh and Another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and Others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. Gurjant Singh Bhullar, Advocate for
Mr. J.P.S. Sidhu, Advocate
for the petitioner in **CWP-7676-2016**.

None for the petitioners in **CWP-186-2014**.

Mr. Aman Dhir, DAG, Punjab.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. As common issues are involved in the captioned petitions, with the consent of both sides, the same are hereby disposed of by this common order. For the sake of brevity and convenience, facts are borrowed from **CWP-7676-2016**.

2. On 19.05.2017, the following order was passed:

“By Annexure P-1, the land of the petitioner was taken so that they would have a direct passage to the Police Line, Mansa. The land was handed over by the land owner on the assurance that his sons would be appointed as Constables in the Police Department.

When the matter is taken up today for hearing, it is contended that the said land was donated and as such no appointment can be given because there is no such policy for giving appointment in such a situation.

This Court is of the opinion that once a promise had been made, it was the bounden duty of the State to honour it and if they are not in a position to honour it, they should return the land of the petitioner.

Counsel for the respondents-State seeks some time to get instructions.

Adjourned to 05.07.2017.”

3. Mr. Aman Dhir, DAG, Punjab submits that it is candid stand of the respondents that they have never taken possession of any part of land of the petitioners. The order of partition has been set aside by Appellate Authority. The said order has not been challenged, thus, order of partition does not exist and entire land has become one piece of land. The respondents are not intending to take possession of petitioners’ land. As no land of the petitioners is taken over by respondents, there is no question of offer of job or compensation.

4. In the wake of statement of learned State counsel, the petition stands ***disposed of***.

5. The petitioners would be at liberty to move an appropriate application if in future respondents take over possession of their land.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

03.09.2025
Prince Chawla

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