



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

211

CWP-13599-2016

Date of decision: 25.03.2026

Surinder Kaur

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAMIT KUMAR

Present : Mr. Shreesh Kakkar, Advocate for
Mr. Kapil Kakkar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Surya Kumar, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Pawan Kumar Goklaney, Advocate and
Mr. Ashish Goklaney, Advocate for respondent No.3.

NAMIT KUMAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, seeking a writ of mandamus, directing the respondents to consider her case for appointment to the post of S.S. Mistress against the seats reserved for BC Category which has not been done despite her higher merit than the last selected candidate in the said category i.e. respondent No.3, only on the ground that BC Certificate is in the name of her husband and not in the name of her father.

2. On 08.10.2025, the following order was passed:-

“Learned counsel appearing on behalf of petitioner submits that, in fact, similar issue pertaining to the same advertisement came up for consideration before this Court in CWP No.6120 of 2016 titled “Veerpal Kaur Vs. State of Punjab and others” decided on 22.07.2024. The coordinate Bench allowed the above said writ petition and

petitioner therein was held entitled for appointment.

It has further been submitted that against the above said judgment, LPA was also filed which was also dismissed by the Division Bench.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of State of Punjab requests for a short adjournment to go through the judgments.

In the interest of justice, adjourned to 19.01.2026.”

3. Learned State counsel has produced copy of the appointment letter dated 24.03.2026, whereby the petitioner has been appointed to the post of S.S. Mistress. The same is taken on record. A copy of the same has been supplied to the learned counsel for the petitioner, who submits that in view of the said appointment, the instant petition has been rendered infructuous.

4. Disposed of as having been rendered infructuous.

25.03.2026

Vinay

(NAMIT KUMAR)
JUDGE

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