



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

109

**CM-3703-CWP-2026 AND
RA-CW-132-2026 IN
CWP-31658-2025
Date of decision: 27.03.2026**

Ankit Vashisht and others

....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Ravinder Singh Dhull, Advocate
for the applicants/petitioners.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR J. (Oral)

RA-CW-132-2026 IN CWP-31658-2025

1. Prayer in this application filed under Order XLVII Rule 1 of CPC read with Sections 114, 151 of CPC and Rule 4 of Chapter XVII-F of the High Court of Punjab and Haryana Rules and Orders, Volume-III for review/modification and clarification of the order dated 12.01.2026.
2. A perusal of the judgment dated 12.01.2026 would reveal that the issue regarding grant of deemed promotions to the private respondents, beyond the permissible quota under the Haryana Municipal Services (Integration, Recruitment and Conditions of Service) Rules, 2010, was directly in issue before this Court in CWP-9138-2023 and



CWP-31658-2025. The matter was considered in detail and decided by assigning elaborate reasons in paragraphs 9 to 18 of the judgment. It was categorically held, particularly in paragraph 15, that since the promotion quota already stood exceeded in the year 2012, the grant of deemed promotions to the private respondents w.e.f. 2012 was impermissible and in clear violation of the statutory quota rule.

3. The conclusions arrived at by this Court are based on detailed interpretation of the applicable statutory rules as well as the settled principles governing the rota-quota system. The law clearly does not allow any deviation from the fixed quota, nor does it permit granting retrospective promotions that adversely affect the rights of direct recruits.

4. The present application, in the garb of review, seeks to re-agitate the very same issues which have already been considered and adjudicated upon by this Court. It is well settled that review jurisdiction is extremely limited and cannot be invoked as an appellate remedy to revisit or re-argue the matter on merits.

5. In the absence of any patent error, new material or sufficient reason within the meaning of Order XLVII Rule 1 of CPC, no case for review is made out.

6. Accordingly, the present review application is dismissed.

CM-3703-CWP-2026 IN CWP-31658-2025

Since the review application stands dismissed, the application i.e. CM-3703-CWP-2026 filed under Section 5 of the



Limitation Act seeking condonation of delay of 16 days in filing the review application, also stands disposed of.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

27.03.2026
yakub

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