

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

- 252
1.

CWP-16468-2023
Date of decision: 22.04.2026
- Deepak Kumar

.....Petitioner
- Versus
- State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents
2.

CWP-16905-2023
Date of decision: 22.04.2026
- Varinder Bansal

.....Petitioner
- Versus
- State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents
3.

CWP-16922-2023
Date of decision: 22.04.2026
- Rajbir Kaur

.....Petitioner
- Versus
- State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents
4.

CWP-16953-2023
Date of decision: 22.04.2026
- Sanjay Kumar

.....Petitioner
- Versus
- State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAMIT KUMAR

Present : Mr. Davinder Singh, Advocate (through VC)
for the petitioners in all the petitions.

Mr. Satnampreet Singh Chauhan, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. K.P.S. Dhaliwal, Advocate for
Mr. Gaurav Datta, Advocate
for respondent No.7 in CWP-16468-2023.

Mr. Jagraj Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Shekhar Verma, Advocate
for respondents No.3 and 6
in all the petitions except CWP-16468-2023.

NAMIT KUMAR, J. (ORAL)

1. This order shall dispose of above-referred four writ petitions as similar issue is involved in them. For the sake of convenience, the facts are being taken from CWP-16468-2023.

1A. The present petition (CWP-16468-2023) has been filed by the petitioner under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, seeking a writ of mandamus, directing the respondents to strictly follow and adhere to selection process as mentioned under instruction/notification/advertisement dated 10.11.2022 (Annexure P-1), issued by the Punjab Public Service Commission, and to consider the candidature of the petitioner as he fulfils all the eligibility criteria for the post of PCS Executive Branch Register C Examination 2023. Further, a writ of certiorari has been sought for setting aside the letter dated 17.07.2023 (Annexure P-2), issued by respondent No.2, whereby they have not considered the candidature of the petitioner, and allow the petitioner to appear in the examination going to be held under the above-mentioned advertisement dated 10.11.2022 (Annexure P-1).

2. While issuing notice of motion on 01.08.2023, the following order was passed:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has applied for the post of Punjab Civil Services (Executive Branch) for an advertisement dated 10.11.2022 (Annexure P-1). The eligibility criteria requires a person to be a confirmed employee and who has completed 8 years of continuous service under the Government apart

from other conditions. The petitioner has preferred this writ petition assailing the order dated 17.07.2023, whereby the candidature of the petitioner has been rejected, by excluding him from the final list on the ground that he does not fulfill the aforesaid condition.

Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner has been working with the PICTES, a society formed by the State Government where he was appointed as a computer teacher and was regularized on 02.12.2010. Thus, he has more than 8 years of regular service but his candidature has wrongly been rejected. The appointment order mentions that the Appointing Authority of the petitioner is the Director General School Education. Learned counsel, thus, submits that the petitioner has been working under the Government and he, therefore, cannot be excluded from the final list.

Notice of motion.

Mr. D.K. Singal, Addl. A.G., Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents-State and seeks time to file reply.

Adjourned to 29.09.2023.

Meanwhile, the petitioner shall be allowed provisionally to participate in the coming examination for the post and his participation shall not create any equity in his favour and his result shall be declared only on further orders from this Court.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) submits that although the petitioner(s) appeared in the examination, however, he/they could not qualify the same, therefore, the instant petition(s) has/have been rendered infructuous.

4. In this view of the matter, all the petitions are disposed of as having been rendered infructuous.

22.04.2026

Vinay

(NAMIT KUMAR)
JUDGE

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