



CWP-27320-2025

-1-

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

115

CWP-27320-2025

Date of Decision: 12.09.2025

Sanjeev Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present: - Mr. Rishav Jain, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. Aman Dhir, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking direction to respondents to complete selection process initiated vide Advertisement No.1 of 2016 dated 31.05.2016. He is further seeking directions to respondents to decide his legal notice dated 19.03.2025, reminder dated 28.05.2025 and representation dated 07.06.2025.

2. The petitioner, pursuant to Advertisement No.1/2016, applied for the post of Constable. He qualified Physical Measurement and Screening Test. He also qualified written test and was called for Medical Test. He was found medically fit. He, as well as many other candidates, challenged selection process before this Court. A bunch of writ petitions came to be decided vide common order dated 05.07.2021. Intra-Court Appeal filed against order dated 05.07.2021 was disposed of vide order dated 16.05.2022. Few candidates filed ***CWP No.25491 of 20223, Balwinder Singh and others***



v. ***State of Punjab and others*** which was allowed vide order 30.04.2024.

The operative portion of order dated 30.04.2024 reads as: -

“9. The stand of respondent-State seems to be misconceived. This Court vide order dated 09.08.2016 directed the State to keep 195 posts of Constable of district police cadre in abeyance. The said posts were part of 4915 posts advertised by advertisement No. 1 of 2016 dated 31.05.2016. The petitioners therein had not participated in the direct recruitment process. They, at that point of time, were part of PAP cadre as Constables. They were claiming that they should be transferred from PAP cadre to district police. The said writ petition stands disposed of vide order dated 04.07.2019. While disposing of writ petitions, this Court has noticed interim order dated 09.08.2016, however, there was no direction to respondents to adjust petitioners therein against said 195 posts whereas it was noticed that there is a list of 500 Constables, who were part of PAP and respondent has concluded that they are eligible for transfer to district police. Name of petitioners therein figured in the list of 500 Constables conceded by respondent eligible for transfer to district police. This Court did not ask to absorb aforesaid petitioners against 195 posts in question. Thus, there was no question to keep aforesaid 195 posts vacant after disposal of writ petition No. 3801 of 2015. The respondent was duty bound to consider all those candidates who participated in the selection process which was initiated vide advertisement No. 1 of 2016. There is no reason to keep aforesaid posts vacant.

10. Accordingly, respondents are hereby directed to fill up 195 posts from those candidates who are eligible and are appearing in the merit list.

11. Let the needful be done within 6 months from today.

12. It is hereby made clear that petitioners would be considered as per their merit and would not get any priority only because of approaching this Court by way of present writ petition. It is further clarified that 195 candidates who would be appointed in terms of order of this Court, shall not



CWP-27320-2025

-3-

be entitled to back wages or any other service benefits. For all purposes, their date of joining would be date of appointment.”

3. The petitioner is claiming appointment letter on the basis of aforesaid order. He has served legal notice upon the respondents.

4. Mr. Aman Dhir, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab, who on advance notice is present in Court on behalf of respondent-State submits that petitioner has secured 24 marks and he applied for District Police Cadre. The cut-off for District Police Cadre is 29 marks. Despite adjustment of 195 candidates as per aforesaid order of this Court, the petitioner cannot be appointed.

5. The petitioner has not brought on record that he has secured more marks than cut-off in District Police Cadre. This Court in ***Balwinder Singh and others (Supra)*** has directed the respondent to issue appointment letter to 195 candidates who are eligible as per original merit list. The petitioner does not fall within the merit list as per learned State counsel and there is nothing contrary on record.

6. In the backdrop, this Court is of the considered opinion that present petition being bereft of merit deserves to be dismissed and accordingly dismissed.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

12.09.2025

Mohit Kumar

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