

(2025) 12 P&H CK 0039

Punjab And Haryana HC

Case No: Civil Writ Petition No. 14312 Of 2022

Satinderjeet Singh

APPELLANT

Vs

State Of Punjab And Others

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision: Dec. 5, 2025

Acts Referred:

- Constitution Of India, 1950-Article 226, 227

Hon'ble Judges: Jagmohan Bansal, J

Bench: Single Bench

Advocate: Aman Dhira

Final Decision: Dismissed

Judgement

Jagmohan Bansal, J

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking setting aside of order dated 17.06.2022 whereby his claim for the post of Constable under 2% quota has been rejected.

2. The petitioner pursuant to Advertisement dated 29.09.2011 applied for the post of Constable. The State Government issued policy dated 11.09.1996 whereby 2% reservation was granted to wards of Police Personnel. The said policy came to be challenged before this Court in CWP NO.13493 OF 2010. This Court vide interim order dated 15.09.2011 ordered that till further orders no appointment against aforesaid quota shall be made. The said petition came to be dismissed vide judgment dated 11.03.2015 meaning thereby 2% quota meant for Wards of Police Personnel was upheld. The respondent did not consider petitioner under 2% quota. The petitioner claims that he was eligible for 2% quota and respondent wrongly denied him said benefit.

3. Learned State counsel submits that in the Advertisement published in the newspaper, there was mistake to the extent that 2% quota was discussed, however, said mistake was corrected by way of corrigendum. In the corrigendum, it was clarified that no benefit will be given to Wards of Police Personnel. Not even single person was appointed against said quota. There was no

intention of the Recruitment Board to grant 2% quota, thus, no candidate was selected. Any order in favour of petitioner would open pandora's box and create right in favour of a number of persons. It may also prejudice interest of those persons who were eligible but did not file petition.

4. The matter relates to recruitment of 2011 and respondent has not granted benefit of 2% reservation to any candidate, thus, claim of petitioner is not sustainable.

5. There is no representation on behalf of the petitioner.

6. DISMISSED with liberty to the petitioner to move an appropriate application within three months from today, if cause survives.