



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**
132+135

Date of decision: 23.06.2026

1. CWP-19298-2026 (O&M)

EHC Vijay Kumar and others

....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

2. CWP-19394-2026 (O&M)

L/EHC Kamlesh Kumari and others

....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Balkar Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) in both the cases.

Mr. Raj Partap Singh Brar, AAG, Haryana.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR J. (Oral)

1. With the consent of all the parties, the aforementioned writ petitions are taken up together and are being decided by this common judgment. For the sake of convenience, facts are taken from CWP-19298-2026.

2. Prayer in the writ petition (CWP-19298-2026) filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, is for issuance of a writ in the nature of *certiorari*, for quashing the impugned order dated 26.05.2026 (Annexure P-1) passed by respondent No.2, vide which the



petitioner(s) have been selected for the Lower School Course List-B1 for 2024.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner(s), *inter alia*, contends that the petitioner(s) are unwilling to undergo the Lower School Course List-B1, which is stated to have commenced w.e.f. 15.06.2026 at Haryana Police Academy, Madhuban. He contends that the petitioner(s), who were selected under the 35% quota for the Lower School Course, 2024, submitted their unwillingness to respondent No.3 on 12.06.2026, as discernible from Annexure P-2. Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) further submits that the petitioner(s) have furnished affidavits specifically stating that they shall neither claim seniority nor seek the benefit of promotion, Assured Career Progression (ACP) or any consequential financial benefits in future on account of their decision not to undergo the said course.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) further submits that the controversy involved in the present petitions is squarely covered by the judgments rendered by this Court in **CWP-24483-2025**, titled as ***EHC Sandeep Kumar and others vs State of Haryana and others***, decided on **04.09.2025** and **CWP-7040-2026**, titled as ***EHC Kaaraj Singh and others vs State of Haryana and others***, decided on **10.03.2026**, wherein this Court has conclusively held that similarly situated employees cannot be compelled to undergo the Lower School Course. Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) further submits that compelling the petitioner(s) to undergo the Lower School Course at this



stage would cause undue hardship, particularly in view of their age, family circumstances and the categorical stand taken by them through their affidavits. He further submits that requiring the petitioner(s) to undergo the said course despite their expressed unwillingness would serve no meaningful purpose and would neither be beneficial to the petitioner(s) nor advance any administrative interest to the State, in any manner.

5. Notice of motion.

6. Mr. Raj Partap Singh Brar, AAG, Haryana, who is present in the Court accepts notice on behalf of the respondent – State and is not in a position to distinguish the case of the present petitioner(s) from those involved in *Sandeep Kumar's case (supra)* and *Kaaraj Singh's case (supra)*.

7. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner(s) submits that he would be satisfied if both the writ petitions of the petitioner(s) are treated as a comprehensive representation and the same be decided by the Superintendent of Police concerned/competent authority by passing a speaking order in a time bound manner.

8. Learned State counsel submits that he has no objection, in case a direction is issued to Superintendent of Police concerned/competent authority for time-bound consideration and decision thereof by passing a speaking order.

9. In view of the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the

2026:PHHC:087907



Superintendent of Police concerned/competent authority is directed to treat both these writ petitions as a comprehensive representation and consider the case of the petitioner(s) and pass a speaking order in the light of the judgments rendered by this Court in *Sandeep Kumar’s case (supra)* and *Kaaraj Singh’s case (supra)*, after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner(s), 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(s).

- 10. It is further directed that till a decision is taken on the aforesaid representation, the operation of the impugned order dated 26.05.2026 (Annexure P-1) shall be kept in abeyance.
- 11. Disposed of, accordingly.
- 12. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of other connected case.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

23.06.2026
yakub

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