



LPA-3014-2024 (O&M)

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

112

LPA-3014-2024 (O&M)
Date of decision : 16.10.2025

Sukhjinder Singh

... Appellant

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.. Respondents

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA**

Present:- Mr. Amardeep Singh, Advocate for the appellant.

Ms. Arundhati Kulshreshtha, AAG, Punjab.

Anupinder Singh Grewal, J. (Oral)

CM-7411-LPA-2024

1. This application is for placing on record Annexures A-4 to A-6.
2. Heard.
3. For the reasons stated in the application, the same is allowed and Annexures A-4 to A-6 are taken on record subject to all just exceptions.

Main case

1. The appellant has challenged the judgment of the Single Bench whereby the writ petition preferred by the appellant seeking his appointment to the post of Constable under 2% quota meant for the 'Wards of Policemen' has been dismissed.

**LPA-3014-2024 (O&M)****-2-**

2. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the father of the appellant had been deputed to fight terrorism in the State of Assam and in the course, he had been awarded 'Disc of Honour' by the Director General of Police, Punjab and therefore, the candidature of the appellant ought to have been considered for appointment to the post of Constable under 2% quota meant for 'Wards of Deserving Policemen'.

3. Learned State counsel submits that the case of the appellant does not fall under the definition of 'Wards of Deserving Policemen' and therefore, his candidature was not considered in this category. The candidature of the appellant had indeed been considered in General category but he had secured 25.5 marks against 28 marks obtained by the last selected candidate in that category.

4. Heard.

5. The father of the appellant, who was a Constable, is stated to have been deputed to serve in the State of Assam. He had been awarded 'Disc of Honour' by the Director General of Police, Punjab. The appellant had applied for the post of Constable pursuant to the advertisement dated 29.09.2011. He had relied upon the instructions issued on 11.06.1996 (Annexure P-1) for considering his candidature under the category of 'Wards of Deserving Policemen'. Vide the instructions, 2% posts had been reserved for 'Wards of Deserving Policemen' in recruitment to the posts of Constables, Asstt. Sub-Inspector and Inspectors out of direct recruitment quota, only in respect of posts, which were previously meant for handicapped persons. It is stated that the conversion of posts meant for handicapped persons to the 'Wards of



LPA-3014-2024 (O&M)

-3-

Deserving Policemen' had been impugned in CWP No.26802 of 2018, titled as 'Bikramjit Singh versus State of Punjab and others', but this Court by its order dated 25.03.2021 has upheld the conversion of posts for the 'Wards of Deserving Policemen'. The LPA-844-2021 against this judgment had also been dismissed on 24.11.2021.

6. It is manifest that the term 'deserving' police personnel has been defined by the instructions as those who have suffered casualties of one or more relatives, suffered permanent disability while in action against terrorist or by terrorists' attack or has been awarded President's Police Gallantry or Police Medal for Gallantry bravery, has taken part in atleast 3 encounters with terrorist or who otherwise in the opinion of the Director General of Police has been in forefront of the fight against terrorism. The relevant extract of the instructions is reproduced hereunder:-

"The term "deserving" will cover wards of the following police personnel:-

i. Who have suffered casualties of one or more the following relatives:

- 1. Father*
- 2. Mother*
- 3. Sister/Brother*
- 4. Son/Daughter*
- 5. Any other dependent family members*

OR

ii. Who has suffered permanent disability on the action against terrorist or attack by terrorist.

OR

iii Who has been awarded President's Police Gallantry or Police Medal for Gallantry bravery in actions against the terrorists.

OR

iv. Who has taken part in atleast 3 encounters with terrorist.

OR

v. Who otherwise in the opinion of the Director General of Police has been in forefront of the fight against terrorism.

The "wards" proposed to covered widow, son, dependent daughter, dependent brother sister or any other dependent family member."

7. We are of the considered view that the father of the appellant does not fall in any of the above-mentioned categories and the appellant is seeking appointment only on the basis of ‘Disc of Honour’ which had been awarded to his father. In the certificate, it has been mentioned that the ‘Disc of Honour’ had been awarded in lieu of his performance on duty with devotion and dedication during operational deployment outside the State. However, it does not indicate that the father of the appellant had actually participated in operations fighting terrorism or would be otherwise eligible as per Clause ‘v’ of the instructions, which includes those police personnel who in the opinion of the Director General of Police were in forefront of the fight against terrorism. Even otherwise in the written statement filed by the State, there is nothing to indicate that the father of the appellant was in forefront of fight against terrorism and the Director General of Police had opined as such.
8. We are, therefore, in agreement with the judgment of the Single Bench dismissing the writ petition preferred by the appellant. Consequently, the Letters Patent Appeal stands dismissed.
9. Pending application, if any, shall stand disposed of accordingly.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

October 16, 2025
sonia gugnani

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