



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

112

CWP-9189-2026 (O&M)
Date of decision: 27.03.2026

Sandeep Kumar

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Bhupender Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vikas Sonak, AAG, Punjab.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, is for issuance of a writ in the nature of *certiorari*, for setting-aside the order dated 22.06.2018 (Annexure P-5). Further a writ of *mandamus* has been sought, directing the officials respondents to consider and decide the representation dated 14.01.2026 (Annexure P-8) filed by the petitioner and further to consider the claim of the petitioner in the light of the settled principles of law and to grant him the benefit from the due date i.e. 22.06.2018 along with all consequential benefits arising therefrom.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends that the petitioner was appointed as Assistant Environmental Engineer on 09.10.2009 under the reserved category (SC) and was placed at serial No.9 in the seniority list circulated on 17.11.2017 (Annexure P-2). A



Departmental Promotion Committee (DPC) meeting was convened on 21.06.2018 to fill up eight posts of Environmental Engineer, out of which two posts were reserved for SC candidates. The promotion order was issued on 22.06.2018, however, the petitioner, despite being senior-most SC candidate in the feeder cadre, was not promoted. He was later promoted on 10.02.2021, resulting in delay of about three years. Through an RTI application (Annexure P-9), the petitioner found that out of the five posts reserved for SC candidates, only three posts were filled up, leaving two vacancies unutilized. The petitioner further found that his name was skipped while Smt. Samita, whose name was not considered by the DPC, was included in the impugned promotion order. During the record inspection, it was also found that the category of a private respondent was altered from reserved to general in the roster register after the promotion order was issued.

3. Learned State counsel, appearing on advance notice, opposes the prayer made by the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner's grievance seeking promotion with effect from the year 2018 cannot be considered at this belated stage on account of delay and laches as a period of more than seven years have passed since 22.06.2018 and he remained indolent for such a long period.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner, at this stage, submits that he would be satisfied if the representation dated 14.01.2026 (Annexure P-8) of the petitioner is decided by respondent No.1 by passing a speaking order in a time bound manner.



5. Learned State counsel submits that he has no objection, in case a direction is issued to the respondent No.1 for time-bound consideration and decision of the representation dated 14.01.2026 (Annexure P-8) of the petitioner by passing a speaking order.
6. Therefore, in view of the limited prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner, the respondent No.1 is directed to consider the representation dated 14.01.2026 (Annexure P-8) of the petitioner and pass a speaking order, after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner, within a period of 03 months from the date of receiving a certified copy of this order. Further, the decision taken thereof shall be conveyed to the petitioner. Needless to say, if the petitioner is found entitled to the relief sought, the same shall be granted forthwith by respondent No.1.
7. Disposed of, accordingly.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

27.03.2026
yakub

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