



289.

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

CWP-11270-2017

Date of decision: 08.04.2026

Narinder Kumar

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAMIT KUMAR

Present: Ms. Alka Chathrath, Advocate, and
Ms. Dhamanpreet Kaur, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Kanav Singla, AAG, Punjab.

NAMIT KUMAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The instant writ petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, seeking issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari, for quashing the seniority list of Masters/Mistresses dated 18.11.2016 (Annexure P-16) to the extent that the petitioner has been placed below respondents No.3 and 4 ignoring the merit determined by the Selection Committee, in violation of Rule 11 of the Punjab State Education Class III (School Cadre) Service Rules, 1978 and the judgment passed by this Court in case *Charan Dass Sharma Versus State of Punjab and others- CWP No.19832 of 2003, decided on 09.07.2004* (Annexure P-5) directing the respondents to determine seniority of the petitioner on the basis of merit. Further, seeking quashing of order dated 03.07.2016 (Annexure P-12) and order dated 27.02.2017 (Annexure P-18) to the extent of promoting respondents No.3 and 4 to the post of Lecturer in Biology, without considering the petitioner, on the basis of wrongly prepared seniority list. Further, respondents No.1 and 2 be directed to fix seniority of

the petitioner as Master as per merit determined by the Selection Committee placing him above the persons who are lower in merit i.e. above respondents No.3 and 4, and to grant him all the consequential benefits, promotion etc. on the basis of his revised seniority.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that during the pendency of the present petition, the impugned seniority list has been revised and in the revised seniority list, the petitioner has been shown senior to the private respondents and has further been promoted to the post of Lecturer in Biology, vide order dated 15.07.2025. She further submits that though the petitioner has been promoted, however, he is entitled for promotion from the date the persons junior to him were promoted and for the said purpose, the petitioner shall submit a detailed representation to the respondents and the same may be considered in a time bound manner.

3. Learned State counsel has no objection to the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner.

4. If any such representation is submitted by the petitioner within a period of four weeks from today, the same shall be considered and disposed of by the competent authority, within a period of three months thereafter.

5. Disposed of in the above terms.

(NAMIT KUMAR)
JUDGE

08.04.2026
sanjeev

Whether speaking/reasoned:
Whether reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No