



207

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

RA-CW-260-2022 IN CWP-9673-2017

Date of Decision: 23.12.2025

Baljit Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and Others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. Amit Jhanji, Senior Advocate with
Mr. G.S. Gopera, Advocate and
Mr. Sahil Sehrawat, Advocate
for the applicant-petitioner.

Ms. Rajni Gupta, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Aditya Yadav, Advocate,
Mr. Atul Bhardwaj, Advocate,
Ms. Hemlata, Advocate and
Mr. Viransh, Advocate
for respondent No.5.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The applicant through instant application is seeking review of order dated 05.09.2022 passed by this Court. The petition was dismissed on the ground of delay and laches. The operative portion of order dated 05.09.2022 reads as:

“7. The writ petition, which has been filed after an inordinate delay of about 10 years after the promotion had been accorded, deserves to be dismissed at the outset on the ground of delay and laches. It is an admitted fact that a merit list had been prepared in the year 2008 reflecting the name of respondent No.5 at serial No.2 with 65.5 marks and the petitioner with 50 marks at serial No.10. The petitioner chose not to challenge the said promotion order at the relevant time and sat back having accepted the same. He approached the authorities concerned for the

first time seeking information under the Right to Information Act, in the year 2011 requesting as to whether Mahima Singh, respondent No.5, was promoted by giving him benefit of reservation and as to which category he belongs. The information was denied by the Commandant citing government notification which had exempted information being supplied of persons belonging to Crime Branch HAP Security/Telecom, IRB and Commando. Again the petitioner chose not to take any appropriate step for redressal of his grievance and then addressed a letter after a period of 5 years to the Inspector General of Police, IRB as to how respondent No.5 could have been promoted under a wrong category. It is only thereafter that the instant writ petition has been filed.

8. The respondents in their reply have admitted that it was on account of an inadvertent mistake that Mahima Singh, respondent No.5, was treated as a Scheduled Caste by taking his Banjara Caste which is under BCA, as Bhanjra caste.

*9. Be that as it may, this Court is of the opinion that the petitioner has been a fence-sitter and has not approached for his grievance within a reasonable time. The cause of action arose when promotion to the post took place in the year 2008, and thereafter the petitioner in a half hearted attempt tried to seek information under the RTI and thereafter, he sat back. He should have approached the Court at the relevant time. Now at this belated stage, his case cannot be considered as it would disturb the whole seniority. The law is well settled that the seniority list as prepared should not be disturbed after a long period of time as would be in the instant case. Reference may be made to the judgment rendered in **State of Uttaranchal Versus Sri Shiv Charan Singh Bhandari 2013(12)SCC 179.***

10. Finding no ground for interference, the writ petition stands dismissed.

2. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that there was fraud on the part of respondent No.5 and fraud vitiates everything. The applicant was not supplied information, thus, he could not pursue his remedy. As soon as he received information, he approached this Court.

3. This Court while passing order dated 05.09.2022 has considered all the arguments of the applicant. There is no plausible and convincing reason warranting review of order dated 05.09.2022 passed by this Court.

4. ***Dismissed.***

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

23.12.2025
Prince Chawla

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