



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH.**

140

**LPA-2178-2025 (O&M).
Date of Decision: 16.10.2025.**

Harmail Singh

....Appellant.

VERSUS

State of Punjab and others

....Respondents.

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

Present: Ms. Anamika Sheoran, Advocate for
Mr. Vikas Singh, Advocate for the appellant.

Mr. Aftab Singh Khara, Sr. Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL, J. (Oral)

CM-5481-LPA-2025

This application is for condonation of delay of 539 days in re-filing the appeal.

Issue notice in the application.

Mr. Aftab Singh Khara, Sr. DAG, Punjab, accepts notice and submits that he has no objection in case the delay in re-filing the appeal is condoned.

Heard.

For the reasons stated in the application, the same is allowed and delay of 539 days in re-filing the appeal is condoned.

LPA-2178-2025

The appellant has challenged the judgment of the Single Bench dated 02.11.2023, whereby his writ petition challenging the appointment of the private respondents to the post of Inspector has been dismissed.

2. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the private respondents had been erroneously appointed as Inspectors on compassionate ground due to the death of their respective parents in harness. Although the parents of the private respondents were working as Conductors, but the private respondents have erroneously been appointed as Inspectors.

3. Heard.

4. It is the case of the appellant that he had been appointed as Conductor in Punjab Roadways on 04.06.1981 and was eligible for promotion to the post of Inspector, but instead private respondents No.5 and 6 had been appointed as Inspectors on compassionate ground on 14.07.1995 and 15.04.1998. It is, however, manifest that the private respondents were appointed as Inspectors prior to the amendment of 2002 to the Punjab Roadways (Operational) State Services Class-III Rules, 1977. Prior to the said amendment of 2002, there was a quota of 20% of the posts of Inspectors to be filled through direct recruitment while remaining 80% of the posts were to be filled by way of promotion from the post of Conductor to Inspector, but by way of amendment, the posts of Inspector were to be filled 100% through promotion. The private respondents had been directly appointed as Inspectors before the amended Rules against the quota of 20%. They also had the requisite qualification of Graduation. The appellant at the time of his appointment as a Conductor was only a matriculate and is later stated to have

graduated on 24.07.1993. Furthermore, the appellant has challenged the appointment of private respondents as Inspectors only in the year 2002 and claimed himself to be better suited for the said post. However, it is apt to notice that in the written statement of respondents No. 1 to 4, it was mentioned that the appellant was not considered for promotion to the post of Inspector as he did not have satisfactory service record.

5. Consequently, we do not find any illegality in the judgment of the Single Bench and the Letters Patent Appeal, being devoid of any merit, stands dismissed.

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

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

16.10.2025
jitender

Whether speaking/ reasoned : Yes/ No
Whether Reportable : Yes/ No