



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH

224

CWP-5351-2022 (O & M)  
Date of decision: 22.07.2025

Baljinder Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and Others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Sardavinder Goyal, Advocate and  
Mr. Nishant Sindhu, Advocate,  
for the petitioner. (through hybrid mode)

Mr. Swapan Shorey, DAG, Punjab.

**AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)**

1. Prayer made is for quashing the order dated 23.04.2018 whereby appointment of the petitioner has been cancelled.
2. Learned counsel submits that the petitioner had applied for appointment as Clerk in the year 2013, however, the said selection was made subject matter of CWP-13398-2014, which was clubbed with a batch of 18 other petitions with the lead case being CWP-12618-2014, which was finally decided on 15.12.2017, however, during pendency thereof in 2016, he acquired 50% share of the gas agency owned by his wife-Virpal Kaur. He was issued appointment letter in compliance to the aforesaid judgment, in 2018, but he could not join in absence of grant of 'No Objection' from the Ministry of Petroleum for which he had sought extension, vide letter dated 09.04.2018, Annexure P-2, as also 25.05.2018, Annexure P-5, whereafter on receipt of NOC in April, 2019,

he submitted the representation dated 12.04.2019, followed by 10.06.2019. Thereafter, on re-constitution w.e.f. 07.05.2019, his wife came to own 100% share in the distributorship. This led to another representation dated 04.01.2021, Annexure P-9. Even after the reference by the Department to the Subordinate Services Selection Board, vide Annexure R-1, it is his categoric case that no new recommendations have been made and consequently, the post is still lying vacant. He prays for re-consideration of the matter taking into consideration the afore facts, in a time bound manner.

3. The aforesaid facts having been brought out, during the course of hearing, learned State counsel, on instructions, states that the respondents would not be averse to having a relook at the matter and decide afresh, taking note of the above facts, within a period of 4 months, uninfluenced by the order(s) impugned in the present case, which this Court has no reason to believe the authorities would not address in a just, fair and reasonable manner.

4. The aforesaid satisfies the learned counsel for the petitioner.

5. The matter stands disposed of accordingly and if the petitioner is found entitled, grant the benefit forthwith. Needless to say, if the orders are adverse to his interest, the same may be passed after granting opportunity of hearing to him and shall contain reasons, whereupon they shall be free to seek legal redress thereupon.

22.07.2025

parveen kumar

**(AMAN CHAUDHARY)**  
**JUDGE**

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