



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

205

CWP-769-2022

Date of Decision: 09.01.2026

SATNAM SINGH

...Petitioner

Vs.

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS.

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. Amarinder Pratap Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner

Mr. Aman Dhir, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking direction to respondent to modify impugned order dated 22.09.2021 and promote him as Sub Inspector.

2. The petitioner was recruited as Constable on 08.04.1986. He passed Lower School Course in 1992 and was promoted as Head Constable. He passed Intermediate School Course in 2011 and was promoted as Assistant Sub Inspector (for short 'ASI') on 23.09.2011. In the seniority list of ASI, his name figured at Sr. No.2083. The respondent in 2021 selected and deputed ASIs for Upper School Course commencing w.e.f. 19.03.2021. The petitioner had already attained age of 56 years, thus, exempted from undergoing said course. As per communication dated 28.10.2021, 9 officers were brought on E-I list on the basis of

having passed Upper School Course. In the said communication, it was noted that petitioner and Balbir Singh are exemptee and they are brought on E-II list w.e.f. 20.07.2021. The petitioner retired on 31.03.2022 on attaining the age of superannuation.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that vide letter dated 05.04.2021, four ASIs belonging to General Category were deputed for Upper School Course. Two of them were junior to petitioner. The petitioner was exemptee, thus, was entitled to promotion along with similarly situated candidates. The respondent-State promoted respondents No.5 and 6 who were junior to him. The respondent No.5 was at Sr. No.2087 and No.6 at 2090 in the seniority list.

4. Learned State counsel submits that respondents No.4 to 13 belong to Scheduled Caste (for short 'SC') Category. They on account of Reservation Policy were promoted though were junior to petitioner as per seniority list. Cut off for General Category was Sr. No.2078 whereas cut off for SC was 2188. There is not even a single junior to petitioner belonging to General Category who was promoted prior to retirement of the petitioner. Even ASI at Sr. No.2082 was promoted after retirement of the petitioner.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

6. From the perusal of record, it is evident that name of petitioner figured at Sr. No.2083 in the seniority list of ASI. He was not required to undergo Upper School Course being 56 years old. His

colleagues were deputed for Upper School Course in March' 2021. Being exemptee he was at par with candidates who were deputed and cleared Upper School Course commencing w.e.f. 19.03.2021. The petitioner is trying to claim parity with respondents No.4 to 13 who belong to SC Category. The petitioner is not assailing Reservation Policy. Respondents No.4 to 13 despite being junior were promoted as Sub Inspectors prior to retirement of petitioner because they belong to SC Category. The petitioner retired on 31.03.2022 and there is not even a single junior who was promoted as Sub Inspector prior to his retirement. The State has clarified that even ASI at Sr. No.2082 was promoted after retirement of the petitioner. In 2021, ASIs up to Sr. No.2078 were promoted. The petitioner cannot claim parity with SC Candidates and there was no candidate belonging to General Category and junior in seniority who was promoted prior to petitioner's retirement, thus, claim of petitioner is not sustainable.

7. In the wake of above discussion and findings, this Court is of the considered opinion that the instant petition deserves to be dismissed and accordingly dismissed.

8. Pending application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

January 09, 2026
Deepak DPA

Whether Speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No