



RA-LP-109-2025 (O&M), RA-LP-127-2025 (O&M) and RA-LP-128-2025 (O&M)

-1-

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

RA-LP-109-2025 (O&M) and RA-LP-128-2025 (O&M) in LPA-691-2022

State of Haryana and othersApplicants/Appellants
Versus

Abhishek VermaRespondent

RA-LP-127-2025 (O&M) in LPA-692-2022

State of Haryana and othersApplicants/Appellants
Versus

Ankur MittalRespondent

Date of decision : 27.01.2026

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SHEEL NAGU, CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present: Mr. Amandeep Singh Talwar, Advocate, for the review applicants
in RA-LP-109-2025 in LPA-691-2022.

Mr. Neeraj Gupta, Addl. Advocate General, Haryana,
for the review applicants/appellants
in RA-LP-127-2025 in LPA-692-2022 and
in RA-LP-128-2025 in LPA-691-2022.

Mr. Arjun Pratap Atma Ram, Advocate (arguing counsel), and
Mr. Brijesh Khosla, Advocate, for non-applicant/respondent No.1
in RA-LP-109-2025 and RA-LP-128-2025 in LPA-691-2022.

Ms. Vibhuti Naraina, Advocate,
for non-applicant/respondent No.1
in RA-LP-127-LP-2025 in LPA-692-2022.

SHEEL NAGU, CHIEF JUSTICE (Oral)

1. This common order shall dispose of three review applications.
RA-LP-109-2025 in LPA-691-2022 has been filed by eleven (11) applicants
claiming themselves to be members of Haryana Civil Service (Executive
Branch) Officers Association, whereas RA-LP-127-2025 in LPA-692-2022
and RA-LP-128-2025 in LPA-691-2022 have been filed by State of Haryana.



2. The applicants in all these three applications are seeking review of common order dated 17.07.2025 passed in LPAs-691-2022 and 692-2022, both preferred by the State of Haryana against common order dated 18.04.2022 passed in CWP No. 6584 of 2019 and 7651 of 2021.

2.1 Vide the order under review, after adjudicating the dispute in question, by relying upon two decisions of Apex Court in ***K. Manjusree v. State of Andhra Pradesh and another, (2008) 3 SCC 512*** and ***Tej Prakash Pathak and others v. Rajasthan High Court and others, 2025 (2) SCC 1***, this Court dismissed both the LPAs in the following terms :

“5. In view of above discussion, this Court sees no reason to take a different view than the one taken by the learned Single Judge.

6. Before parting, it would be appropriate to note that despite the petitioners’ case being based on sound and time-tested principles of Service Jurisprudence, the action of the functionaries of the State of Haryana appears to be not bona fide. This litigation ought not to have arisen in the very first place had the State of Haryana and its functionaries obtained proper legal advice. The action of the appellants herein appears to be merely to scuttle the genuine claim of the petitioners. Thus the appellant-State of Haryana is liable to be saddled with cost of Rs. 50,000/- out of which Rs. 10,000/- each shall be paid to both the petitioners, namely, Abhishek Verma and Ankur Mittal and the remaining amount of Rs. 30,000/- shall be credited in the account of Punjab & Haryana Bar Association, Chandigarh for having wasted precious time of this Court in pursuing this avoidable piece of litigation.

7. With the above observations, both the appeals stand dismissed with costs.”



3. Review applicants in RA-109-LP-2025, who are claiming themselves to be members of HCS (Executive Branch) Officers Association, who were not parties either in the writ petitions (CWPs No. 6584 of 2019 and 7651 of 2021) or before this Court in LPAs No. 691 and 692 of 2022, are before this Court seeking their impleadment as interveners in LPA No. 691 of 2022, by way of CM-7588-LPA-2025; and also review of order dated 17.07.2025 of this Court, by alleging that there is a palpable error in the order under review on the strength of judgment dated 23.08.2022, whereby Co-ordinate Bench of this Court, which was dealing with the issue of vires of Rules 4, 6, 8, 11 and Schedule 1 of the Haryana Outstanding Sports Persons (Recruitment and Conditions of Service Rules, 2018), on the basis of statement made by learned counsel for the State of Haryana that no appointment to HCS and HPS had been made under the Rules of 2018, disposed of CWPs No. 24683 of 2018 and 2941 of 2019 as having rendered infructuous.

4. Pertinently, in aforesaid two writ petitions, i.e. CWPs No. 24683 of 2018 and 2941 of 2019, an interlocutory order was passed on 20.02.2019, which was to the following extent :-

“We have heard learned counsel for the rival parties qua the grievance raised in the present petition. We did see that by virtue of notification dated 5.9.2018, there is a reservation from the Haryana Outstanding Sports Persons to be directly recruited to Group I posts irrespective of the educational qualification or academic qualification required for the post. Prima facie, we are of the opinion that there should be no difficulty if such outstanding sports persons are accommodated in the lower posts like Class III or Class II posts. But keeping in mind the nature of the



skill/education required for the job to be performed by Class I or Group A employees and keeping in view the intelligencia required for the Group A post, we do not think that the outstanding sports persons should be directly recruited to Group A or Class I posts without the required educational qualification/skill/experience as required and also without qualifying examination etc. That would affect the administration. We may add that if government wants to grant incentives to them, the same can be granted in a different form.

We, therefore, grant a chance to the State Government to rethink and revisit the rules in question for streamlining the issue.

Adjourned to 7.3.2019.

Photocopy of the order be placed in the connected file.”

5. It is pertinent to point out that grounds No. (vi) and ((vii) with regard to order passed in CWPs No. 24683 of 2018 and 2941 of 2019 had been raised by the State of Haryana in LPA-691-2022, but since the same were not dealt with in the order under review, therefore, these are deemed to be rejected by the order under review.

6. From the aforesaid, it is obvious that there was no writ, order or direction issued restraining any appointment to be made under the Rules of 2018, which were statutory in nature.

7. Learned counsel for the State of Haryana does not dispute that the Rules of 2018 were primarily repealed on 26.02.2021.

8. This Court, while passing the order under review, was faced with a situation to adjudicate the validity of rejection of candidature of two candidates, namely Ankur Mittal and Abhishek Verma, which took place on



29.11.2018 and on 06.01.2020, respectively, when the 2018 Rules were still in existence and in force.

9. Therefore, vide order under review, this Court, while following the time-tested principle of Service Jurisprudence that once the game has begun, rules of game cannot be changed, upheld decision of the learned Single Judge in favour of both the candidates, and dismissed both the LPAs filed by the State of Haryana.

10. Thus, it is obvious that there is no palpable error, which may be found in the order under review.

11. More so, these three review applications appear to be vexatious and, therefore, need to be dismissed with heavy costs, as these have consumed enough time of this Court, which could been used in more pressing matters.

12. Accordingly, all these review applications stand dismissed, each with cost of Rs. 25,000/-, to be deposited by the applicant(s) in each review application in favour of Punjab & Haryana Bar Association, Chandigarh, within a period of fifteen days.

13. Since RA-LP-109-2025 has been dismissed, therefore, CM-7588-LPA-2025 filed by review applicants for their impleadment also stands dismissed.

14. All the pending applications stand disposed of.

(SHEEL NAGU)
CHIEF JUSTICE

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

January 27, 2026
narotam

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