



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

112

CWP-28341-2025

Date of Decision: 30.09.2025

GURSHARANJIT SINGH

...Petitioner

Vs.

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS.

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. F.S. Dhillon, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. Aman Dhir, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India is seeking direction to respondents to grant him two marks in view of Clause 9 of the Advertisement No.1/2016 dated 31.05.2016.

2. The petitioner, pursuant to Advertisement No.1/2016 dated 31.05.2016, applied for the post of Constable. He was selected in February' 2017 in the Armed Police Cadre. He was not granted two marks for his service in the National Security Guard ('NSG'). He has served for three years in NSG. He claims that he is entitled to two additional marks for serving in NSG. In September' 2024, Director General of Police, Punjab issued show cause notice calling upon him to show cause as to why he should not be dismissed from service. The dismissal notice was issued in view of revised merit list. The petitioner

along with 47 other Constables preferred *CWP No.24465 of 2024* which was ordered to be listed along with *LPA No.2038 of 2023*. This Court vide order dated 30.04.2025 passed in *CWP No.25491 of 2023* has directed respondent to fill up 195 posts lying vacant in District Cadre. The respondent has published revised merit list to fill up 195 posts.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he was not granted two marks for his service in NSG. The respondent has revised result multiple times during 2016 to 2022 and again in 2025 as per orders of this Court, the respondent has filled up 195 seats. In the wake of these circumstances, the claim of petitioner needs to be considered. He cannot be deprived from two marks of NSG.

4. In view of directions dated 22.09.2025 of this Court, learned State counsel has received instructions. He submits that question of two marks of NSG service was one of the issues raised before this Court in a bunch of 209 writ petitions including *CWP-22985-2016*. This Court vide judgment dated 05.07.2021 directed State Government to remeasure height of the candidates and consider them for two marks of NSG service. The respondent released tentative result on 25.03.2022. Objections were invited from candidates. More than 100 objections were received, however, no objection was received from petitioner. Final result was prepared on 18.05.2022 which was uploaded on the official website on 24.05.2022. Few candidates approached this Court which vide judgment dated 26.05.2023 disposed of a bunch of 53 writ petitions including *CWP-2208-2017*. The Court held that State shall be bound by the final merit list dated 18.05.2022. In view of said order, merit list dated

18.05.2022 cannot be changed.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record of the case.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner is claiming that respondents despite orders of this Court are revising select list as well as waiting list. Even in 2025 revised select list and waiting list has been issued.

7. The petitioner was selected in 2016 and he is still working with Punjab Armed Police. He is claiming two marks of NSG service. He did not claim two marks while objections were invited against tentative result dated 25.03.2022. He was not required to be party in the writ petitions which led to judgment dated 05.07.2021, however, he was supposed to lodge his claim within prescribed period against tentative result dated 25.03.2022. This Court while passing judgment dated 05.07.2021 has considered question of two marks of NSG service. The petitioner neither at that point of time filed petition nor raised objection to tentative select list. A period of 9 years from his selection has passed away. At this stage, it would not be appropriate to direct respondent to reconsider his claim especially in view of order dated 05.07.2021 and 26.05.2023 passed by this Court. The fact that respondent has revised result in the intervening period does not create right in favour of petitioner especially when he is in service.

8. In the wake of above factual position, this Court is of the considered opinion that the instant petition deserves to be dismissed and

accordingly dismissed

9. Pending application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

September 30, 2025
Deepak DPA

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