



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

**CWP No. 32317 of 2025
Date of Decision: 17.11.2025**

Yogesh

....Petitioner

VS.

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

**Present: Mr. Manoj Kumar Taya, Advocate
for the petitioner**

Mr. Ashok Kumar Khubbar, Addl. A.G., Haryana

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. On 03.11.2025, the following order was passed by this Court:-

“ The petitioner through instant petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India is seeking setting aside of order dated 26.09.2025 (Annexure P-11) whereby his appointment order dated 20.10.2024 (Annexure P-2) has been cancelled and his request for extension of time to join as Constable has been declined.

The petitioner applied for the post of Constable in General Category against advertisement No. 6/2024 dated 28.06.2024. He successfully cleared all the stages of examination and was finally selected as Constable. He was allotted Constabulary number vide order dated 20.10.2024. The respondent conducted



verification of antecedents and did not find any criminal case against him.


The petitioner did not join service and respondent recorded DDR in this regard on 27.12.2024. He claims that he did not join because he was pursuing his M.Sc.(Physics final year). 3rd Semester examination of M.Sc. was due in December' 2024 and 4th Semester examination in May' 2025. He appeared in both the examinations and thereafter requested respondent vide letter dated 26.09.2025 to extend joining period. The respondent by impugned order has rejected his request. The impugned rejection order is based upon Government Instructions dated 13.09.2018 whereby it has been provided that in case of fresh appointment, candidate will have to join within maximum period of thirty days.

*Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that instructions are contrary to Rules. As per judgment dated 01.08.2024 passed by this Court in **CWP No. 21992 of 2023**, titled as '**Satish Khurana vs. State of Haryana and others**' the instructions being contrary to Rules deserve to be ignored. The respondent has further wrongly relied upon Clause (iv) of the Instructions whereas Clause (v) is applicable to his case because posts are lying vacant.*

Learned State counsel seeks time to get instructions especially with respect to extending time of any other candidate.

Adjourned to 17.11.2025."

2. On being confronted with the fact that afore-cited judgment of this Court in **Satish Khurana (supra)** in the light of instructions dated 13.09.2018 does not advance his case, learned counsel for the petitioner



seeks permission to withdraw the instant petition with liberty to file afresh with better particulars.

3. Dismissed as withdrawn with aforesaid liberty.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

17.11.2025
paramjit

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes	
Whether reportable:		No