



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

109

CWP-21095-2025 (O&M)

DATE OF DECISION : 25th July, 2025

Kanu Sharma

.... **Petitioner**

Versus

**High Court of Punjab and Haryana at
Chandigarh and others**

.... **Respondents**

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SHEEL NAGU, CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY**

* * *

Present : Mr.Abhay Gupta, Advocate (arguing counsel) with
Mr.Agampreet Singh, Advocate, and
Mr.Deepkanwal Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr.Amit Jhanjhi, Senior Advocate (arguing counsel)
assisted by Mr.B.S.Patwalia, Advocate for
respondent No.1 – High Court.

Mr.Deepak Balyan, Additional
Advocate General, Haryana.

Mr.Vipin Pal Yadav, Additional
Advocate General, Punjab.

* * *

SHEEL NAGU, CJ. (Oral)

1. Present petition, filed by an aspirant for recruitment and appointment into the Superior Judicial Service, has assailed the constitutional validity of Rule 11(bb) of the Haryana Superior Judicial



Service Rules, 2007 (*hereinafter for short 'Haryana Rules'*) and also Rule 10(bb) of the Punjab Superior Judicial Service Rules, 2007 (*hereinafter for short 'Punjab Rules'*).

2. Learned senior counsel for the High Court has drawn the attention of this Court to the decision of a coordinate Bench of this Court rendered on 21.03.2024 in a bunch of petitions, including **CWP-27851-2023** titled '**Rajender and others vs. State of Haryana and another**', upholding the legal and constitutional validity of the Haryana Rules and the Punjab Rules.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has not given us any ground to take a different view than the one taken by the coordinate Bench of this Court in **Rajender's case** (*supra*).

4. It is also informed by the senior counsel appearing for the High Court that the said decision has attained finality in the absence of any challenge to the same. It is further submitted by the senior counsel that the decision dated 24.09.2019 in **CWP-21026-2019** titled '**Dr.Gurpuneet Singh Randhawa vs. The Registrar General, Punjab and Haryana High Court, Chandigarh**', which was relied upon by the coordinate Bench in **Rajender's case** (*supra*) has also not been challenged further and, thus, has attained finality.

5. In view of the above, it would be appropriate for us to give quietus to the matter since legality and constitutional validity of the Haryana Superior Judicial Service Rules, 2007 and the Punjab Superior Judicial Service Rules, 2007, has been upheld by a coordinate Bench.



6. Accordingly, there is no substance in the present petition, which stands dismissed, as infructuous.

(SHEEL NAGU)
CHIEF JUSTICE

25th July, 2025
‘gian’

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned:</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable:</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>