courtkutchehry.com

Company: Sol Infotech Pvt. Ltd.
Website: www.courtkutchehry.com
Printed For:
Date: 08/11/2025

(2010) 11 P&H CK 0567

High Court Of Punjab And Haryana At Chandigarh

Case No: Civil Writ Petition No. 20095 of 2010

Bhoop Singh	APPELLANT
Vs	
State of Haryana and Others	RESPONDENT

Date of Decision: Nov. 11, 2010

Hon'ble Judges: Ranjit Singh, J

Bench: Single Bench

Judgement

Ranjit Singh, J.
This order will dispose of eight Civil Writ Petition Nos. 20095 of 2010 Bhoop Singh v. State of Haryana and Ors., 20096 of 2010 Santosh Devi v. State of Haryana and Ors., 20097 of 2010 Vijay Parkash v. State of Haryana and Ors., 20098 of 2010 Mahavir Singh v. State of Haryana and Ors., 20099 of 2010 Ajit Singh v. State of Haryana and Ors., 20100 of 2010 Ram Niwas v. State of Haryana and Ors., 20116 of 2010 Dalbir Singh v. State of Haryana and Ors. and 20120 of 2010 Joginder Singh v. State of Haryana and Ors. as common question of law and fact arises in all these cases. The facts are being taken from CWP No. 20095 of 2010.

2. The petitioner has filed this writ petition praying for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to promote him to the post of Assistant with effect from the date his juniors have been so promoted along with all consequential benefits.

3. The petitioner was appointed as Accounts Clerk and joined the service on 5.3.1990. He claims to be working on the said post with full honesty, dedication and hard work. In the year 1995, the respondents promoted some junior persons to the post of Assistant. One of the co-worker of the petitioner challenged the promotion granted to said junior persons. On 16.8.2005, this Court disposed of Civil Writ Petition No. 18333 of 2002 and order in this regard is annexed as Annexure P-2. The State filed SLP against the same, which has also been dismissed. Accordingly, said petitioner Tilak Raj was promoted. Consequently, other persons, similarly situated, also filed various writ petitions and now the respondents

have also started promoting the clerks without insisting on the condition of passing the type test. The petitioner accordingly made a claim for promotion from the date when some of his juniors have been so promoted. Names of the juniors are mentioned in the writ petition. Once no action is being taken, the petitioner has filed this writ petition.

4. Counsel for the petitioner submits that for the same cause, the petitioner has already served a legal notice, which is annexed as Annexure P-5 in all the writ petitions. Counsel further says that he would be satisfied in case the writ petitions are disposed of with a direction to the respondents to decide the legal notice in accordance with law and also in terms of the law laid down by this Court.

5. Accordingly, the writ petitions are disposed of with a direction to the respondents to decide the legal notice served by the petitioners on the respondents within a period of three months from the date of receipt of copy of this order and pass an appropriate order in accordance with law and in terms of the law laid down by this Court.