



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Date of Decision:02.02.2026

CWP No. 28333-2025(O&M)

EASI Mukesh Kumar and others

....Petitioners

VS.

State of Haryana and another

....Respondents

CWP No.37702-2025(O&M)

Virender and others

....Petitioners

VS.

State of Haryana and another

....Respondents

CWP No.38130-2025(O&M)

EHC Pankaj Verma

....Petitioner

VS.

State of Haryana and another

....Respondents

CORAM: HON’BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present: Mr. Manish Soni, Advocate
Mr. Gurdeep Grewal, Advocate
for the petitioners

Ms. Ambika Luthra, Addl. A.G., Haryana



JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. By this common order, CWP Nos. 28333 of 2025, 37702 of 2025 and 38130 of 2025 are hereby adjudicated as common questions of law and facts are involved. With the consent of both sides, facts are borrowed from CWP No. 28333 of 2025.

2. This Court while issuing notice of motion on 22.08.2025 passed following order:-

1. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that this Court while adjudicating CWP No.24483 of 2025 has not considered Rule 13.7(5) of Punjab Police Rules, 1934 (as applicable to State of Haryana) (for short 'PPR'). The petitioners are Exemptee Head Constables and at present are holding post of Exemptee Assistant Sub-Inspectors. As per Rule 13.7(5) of PPR, they cannot be compelled to undergo Lower School Course. If they opt for Lower School Course, they are bound to relinquish their exemptee higher rank. They are supposed to be reverted back to substantive rank of Constable. The petitioners are more than 40 years old, thus, cannot be compelled to undergo Lower School Course without their written consent under 35% seniority-cum-merit quota.

2. Notice of motion returnable for 16.12.2025.

3. Mr. Ashok Kumar Khubbar, Additional Advocate General, Haryana, who on advance notice is present in Court accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State and seeks time to file reply and address the arguments.

4. In the meantime, the petitioners are at liberty to approach the respondent with respect to their claim that they are more than 40 years old, thus, not covered by 35% quota."



3. Learned counsel for the petitioners, at the outset, submits that petition may be disposed of in terms of judgment dated 04.09.2025 passed by this Court in ‘*Sandeep Kumar and others v. State of Haryana and Others*’, *CWP No.24483 of 2025*.

4. Ms. Ambika Luthra, Addl. A.G., Haryana expressed her inability to controvert applicability of aforesaid judgment to the facts of instant case.

5. In the wake of statement of learned counsel for both sides, the petitions stand disposed of in terms of judgment dated 04.09.2025 passed by this Court in *Sandeep Kumar and others (supra)*.

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

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

02.02.2026
paramjit

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes	
Whether reportable:		No