

**LPA-718-2026****-1-****IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH****112****LPA-718-2026****Date of decision: 29.04.2026****MANDER SINGH AND ANR.****...APPELLANTS****VERSUS****STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS.****...RESPONDENTS****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI****HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI**

Present: Mr. Hemen Aggarwal, Advocate and
Mr. Dashim Garg, Advocate
for the appellants.

Ms. Shruti, AAG, Punjab.

JASGURPREET SINGH PURI, J. (Oral)

1. The present intra-court appeal has been filed by the appellants assailing the order passed by learned Single Bench dated 25.02.2026 in CWP-5936-2026 titled as “Mander Singh and Anr. Vs. State of Punjab through Secretary and Others”.

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the appellants submitted that the appellants have filed a writ petition seeking judicial review of definition of “deserving policemen” which is provided in the policy decision taken by the Government of Punjab, Department of Home Affairs and Justice (Home Branch) dated 11.06.1996 (Annexure P-3) wherein it has been provided that there will be 2% reservation for the wards of “deserving policemen” for recruitment as Constables, Asstt. Sub

**LPA-718-2026****-2-**

Inspectors and Inspectors. The categories have also been mentioned as to in what cases the aforesaid reservation will be applicable. He submits that undoubtedly the appellants do not fall in any of the aforesaid categories or the parameters but there can be no discrimination in this regard and submitted that the appellants should also be considered on the same lines by extending the scope of the aforesaid parameters which have been laid down in (Annexure P-3) dated 11.06.1996. He submits that the learned Single Judge has dismissed the writ petition on the ground that the Court would not interfere in the policy matter of the State.

3. We have heard learned counsel for the appellants.

4. The writ petition was filed by the appellants seeking judicial review of the definition of “deserving policemen” and with a further prayer to extend the eligibility under 2% quota to all the wards of police personnel. In this way, the appellants have not challenged the policy of the State Government dated 11.06.1996 (Annexure P-3) but they are wanting that they should also be granted the benefit of the aforesaid quota by extending the definition of “deserving policemen” towards all the wards of police personnel.

5. The aforesaid policy dated 11.06.1996 (Annexure P-3) is reproduced as under:-

“To

*The Director General of Police,
Punjab, Chandigarh.*

*Memo No.1 (211)94-2H(I)/10176
Dated, Chandigarh the 11.06.1996.*

*Subject: Direct recruitment in the rank of Constables,
Assistant Sub Inspectors and Inspectors of
Police-Reservation of 2% posts for wards of
deserving policemen.*

Reference your memo no.34388/E-3, Dated



LPA-718-2026

-3-

15.11.95 on the subject noted above.

2. The Governor of Punjab is pleased to record sanction to reserve 2% posts for the wards of deserving policemen for recruitment as Constables, Asstt. Sub Inspectors and Inspectors out of direct recruitment quota only in respect of active field posts, which were previously meant for handicapped persons.

The term "deserving" will cover wards of the following Police Personnel:-

i) We have suffered casualties of one or more of the following relatives:-

a) Father

b) Mother

c) Sister/Brother

d) Son/daughter

e) Any other dependent family member

OR

ii) Who has suffered permanent disability on account of action against terrorists or attack by terrorists.

OR

iii) Who has been awarded President's Police Medal for Gallantry or police Medal for Gallantry for showing bravery in actions against terrorists.

OR

iv) Who has taken part in atleast 3 encounters with terrorists.

OR



LPA-718-2026

-4-

v) *Who otherwise in the opinion of the Director General of Police has been in forefront of the fight against terrorism. The "Wards" proposed to be covered would be dependent, son, dependent daughter, dependent brother, dependent sister or any other dependent family members."*

3. *The persons to be given such appointments against 2% proposed quota would be selected by the following two types or committees, for which proposal may be sent to Govt.:-*

a) *in respect of Constables:-*

The Committee for the recruitment of Constables would be constituted by the Director General of Police, in accordance with instructions of the personal Deptt.

b) *In respect of ASIs/Inspectors.*

The Committee in respect of enlistment of ASIs/Inspectors will be headed by the Principal Secretary Home, the other member of the committee will be as per instructions of the Personnel Department.

4. *This issue with the approval of C.M.M. as conveyed vide Department of General Admn (in cabinet Affairs Br.) U.O. No.1/95/96/Cabinet/ 2926, Dated 30.5.1996.*

Sd/-

Deputy Secretary Home (G)

A copy is forwarded to the Secretary to Govt. of Punjab, Department of General Admn. (Cabinet Affairs Br.) w.r.t to their letter No.1/95/96-Cabinet/2926, Dated 30.05.96 for information.



LPA-718-2026

-5-

Sd/-

Deputy Secretary Home (G)”

6. A perusal of aforesaid policy would show that 2% reservation has been made in case of fulfillment of the parameters which include those policemen who have suffered casualties, suffered permanent disability, awarded President’s Police Medal for Gallantry or police Medal for Gallantry for showing bravery in actions against terrorists and also those who otherwise in the opinion of the Director General of Police have been in forefront of the fight against terrorism.

7. Therefore, it is clear that the aforesaid policy has been made for the purpose of granting benefit to the wards of those police personnel who basically have been fighting with the terrorists in different methods and in this regard, various parameters have been laid down.

8. The grievance of the appellants is not that the aforesaid policy should be scrapped but their grievance is that they should also be considered in the aforesaid policy by extending the scope of the aforesaid policy from “deserving policemen” to all “wards of Police Personnel”.

9. After hearing learned counsel for the appellants, we are of the considered view that the learned Single Judge has rightly dismissed the petition by observing that the Court would not interfere in the policy matters of the State when the State of Punjab had been subjected to terrorism at various stages and various phases especially after the year of 1990 and the Government had framed some policy with regard to the grant of some benefit to the deserving policemen and granting 2% reservation pertaining to those deserving policemen who have been involved in the aforesaid activities by fighting with terrorism. The appellants in the absence of challenge to the aforesaid policy for

**LPA-718-2026****-6-**

scrapping the same cannot plead and seek the relief that they should also be considered at par with the aforesaid “deserving policemen”. This is not within the scope of Article 226 of the Constitution of India nor within the scope of present appeal to interfere with the policy of the State Government. We are therefore, of the considered view that there is no error in the judgment passed by learned Single Judge and no ground is made out for interference in the present Letters Patent Appeal.

10. Consequently, finding no merit in present appeal, the same is hereby dismissed.

11. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)
JUDGE

29.04.2026*Sunil Devi*

(AMARJOT BHATTI)
JUDGE

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