



CWP-PIL-379 of 2025

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

CWP-PIL-379 of 2025

Date of decision: 01.04.2026

ROOPINDER SINGH ALIAS RUPINDER SINGH**....Petitioner****V/S****STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS****... Respondents**

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

Present: Mr. Nitin Verma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Salil Sabhlok, Senior Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

SHEEL NAGU, CHIEF JUSTICE (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed as a Public Interest Litigation (PIL) challenging the compassionate appointment extended to respondent No. 5 to the post of Inspector in Punjab Police, which was made sometime in the year 2009 or prior thereto.
2. At the outset, it would have been appropriate for the petitioner to move an application seeking issuance of a writ of quo warranto, which has not been done in the present case.
3. Even otherwise, the scheme governing compassionate appointment, under which respondent No. 5 came to be appointed, has not been placed on record by the petitioner.
4. Looking to the facts raised and the relief sought, it is obvious that the issue raised in this PIL relates to service dispute. The Apex Court in the cases of **Dr. Duryodhan Sahu vs. Jitendra Kumar, (1998) 7 SCC 273; Neetu Vs. State of Punjab, (2007) 10 SCC 614; Dattaraj Nathuji Thaware vs. State of Maharashtra, (2005) 1 SCC 590; and Vishal Ashok Thorat and others vs.**



Rajesh Shripambapu and others, (2020) 18 SCC 675, has been of consistent view that a service dispute cannot be raised by way of a Public Interest Litigation

5. The relevant extract of Dattaraj Nathuji Thaware's case (supra) is reproduced hereunder for ready reference:-

“11. As noted supra, a time has come to weed out the petitions, which though titled as public interest litigations are in essence something else. It is shocking to note that Courts are flooded with large number of so-called public interest litigations where even a minuscule percentage can legitimately be called as public interest litigations. Though the parameters of public interest litigation have been indicated by this Court in large number of cases, yet unmindful of the real intentions and objectives, Courts are entertaining such petitions and wasting valuable judicial time which, as noted above, could be otherwise utilized for disposal of genuine cases. Though in Dr. Duryodhan Sahu and Ors. v. Jitendra Kumar Mishra and Ors. 1998 (4) SCT 213 (SC) , this Court held that in service matters PILs should not be entertained, the inflow of so-called PILs involving service matters continues unabated in the Courts and strangely are entertained. The least the High Courts could do is to throw them out on the basis of the said decision. The other interesting aspect is that in the PILs, official documents are being annexed without even indicating as to how the petitioner came to possess them. In one case, it was noticed that an interesting answer was given as to its possession. It was stated that a packet was lying on the road and when out of curiosity the petitioner opened it, he found copies of the official documents. Apart from the sinister manner, if any, of getting such copies, the real brain or force behind such cases would get exposed to find out the truth and motive behind the petition. Whenever such frivolous pleas, as noted, are taken to explain possession, the Court should do well not only to



CWP-PIL-379 of 2025

dismiss the petitions but also to impose exemplary costs. It would be desirable for the Courts to filter out the frivolous petitions and dismiss them with costs as afore-stated so that the message goes in the right direction that petitions filed with oblique motive do not have the approval of the Courts.”

- 6. This Court has also taken a similar view in CWP-PIL-138 of 2024, decided on 17.07.2024, titled ‘*Sourabh vs. State of Haryana and others*’.
- 7. In view of above, no case for interference is made out. Accordingly, present petition is dismissed.
- 8. All pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(SHEEL NAGU)
CHIEF JUSTICE

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

01.04.2026
Kamal Gandhi

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