



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

146

**CWP-19446-2026 (O&M)
Date of decision: 24.06.2026**

L/EHC Mukesh 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.

Mr. Rajiv Malhotra, DAG, Haryana.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this writ petition filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, is for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus, directing the respondents No.3 and 4 for not to send the petitioners for Lower School Course, 2025 as the petitioners have been selected for the promotion list-B-1 under 35% seniority-cum-fitness category, which is scheduled to commence on 27/28.06.2026 at Madhuban, Karnal, for which the petitioners have already given their unwillingness.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners, *inter alia*, contends that the petitioners are unwilling to undergo the Lower School Course List-B1, which is scheduled to commence on 27/28.06.2026 at Haryana Police Academy, Madhuban. He contends that the petitioners, who were



selected under the 35% quota for the Lower School Course, 2024, submitted their unwillingness by way of affidavit dated 18.06.2026, as discernible from Annexure P-1. Learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that the petitioners in their affidavits of unwillingness have specifically stated 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 petitioners further submits that the controversy involved in the present petition 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 petitioners further submits that compelling the petitioners 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 petitioners to undergo the said course despite their expressed unwillingness would serve no meaningful purpose and would neither be beneficial to the petitioners nor advance any administrative interest to the State, in any manner.



5. Notice of motion.

6. Mr. Rajiv Malhotra, DAG, 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 petitioners from those involved in *Sandeep Kumar's case (supra)* and *Kaaraj Singh's case (supra)*.

7. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that he would be satisfied if the present writ petitions of the petitioners is 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 Superintendent of Police concerned/competent authority is directed to treat this writ petition as a comprehensive representation and consider the case of the petitioners 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 petitioners, 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.

10. It is further directed that till a decision is taken on the aforesaid representation, the operation of the order/direction dated 12.06.2026 (Annexure P-4), shall be kept in abeyance.

11. Disposed of, accordingly.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

24.06.2026
yakub

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