

CWP-5225 of 1993

2026:PHHC:016502



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

CWP-5225 of 1993

Date of decision: 04.02.2026

Raghubir Singh Bishnoi

.....Petitioner

Versus

The State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAMIT KUMAR

Present: - None for the petitioner.

Mr. Priyavrat Parashar, AAG, Haryana.

NAMIT KUMAR, J. (ORAL)

1. Instant writ petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for quashing the seniority list (Annexure P-3) and order (Annexure P-4) whereby respondents No.2 and 3 have been promoted from the post of Assistant Employment Officers to the post of District Employment Officers and for directing respondent No.1 to make promotions against the vacancies of District Employment Officers which were available prior to promulgation of the Haryana Employment Department (Group-B) Service Rules-1991 as notified on 24.01.1991 in accordance with the eligibility criteria and source of recruitment provided under the old rules known as “The Punjab Employment Department (Class-I & II) Service Rules, 1963” with a further direction to respondent No.1 to consider and promote the petitioner against one of such vacancies in accordance with the old rules with all consequential benefits. Further direction has been sought

CWP-5225 of 1993

2026:PHHC:016502



to respondent No.1 to refix seniority of the petitioner in the cadre of Assistant Employment Officers by assigning him seniority from the year of allotment, 1978, which were advertised in 1980 as Haryana Civil Services (Executive Branch) and Allied Services and were actually filled in the year 1984.

2. The matter relates to the year 1993. Earlier, due to non-filing of process fee, service upon respondents No.2 and 3 could not be effected and fresh notices were ordered to be issued to respondents No.2 and 3 vide order dated 14.07.2025. Again vide order dated 12.08.2025, fresh notices were ordered to be issued to respondents No.2 and 3 on filing of their fresh/correct addresses and fresh addresses of respondents No.2 and 3 were furnished by respondent No.1. Again, vide order dated 03.12.2025, fresh notices were ordered to be issued to respondents No.2 and 3 and *dasti* process was given to the petitioner. As per office report, service report has not been submitted by the petitioner. Learned counsel for the petitioner is not present.

3. Dismissed for non-prosecution.

04.02.2026
R.S.

(NAMIT KUMAR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether Reportable : Yes/No