



6) CWP-26413-2015
Meeta Rani and others ...Petitioners
Versus
State of Haryana and others ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Karamveer Singh Banyana, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) (in CWP-24313-2015 &
CWP-27336-2015).

Mr. Sanjeev Kumar Birla, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) (in CWP-11189-2016).

Mr. Lalit Rishi, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) (in CWP-27585-2015 &
CWP-26413-2015).

Mr. Chandra Sekhar, Advocate for
Mr. Umesh Narang, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) (in CWP-25883-2015).

Mr. Piyush Khanna, Addl.A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Arvind Seth, Advocate
for respondent No.2-HSAMB.

Mr. Amit Rao, Advocate
for respondents No.2 & 3 (in CWP-11189-2016 &
CWP-26413-2015).

Mr. Arvind Galav, Advocate and
Mr. Dharamjit, Advocate
for respondents No.5 to 11 (in CWP-24313-2015).

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. Vide the common order, the bunch of the above mentioned writ petitions are disposed of as learned counsel for the parties are *ad idem* that all the petitions can be disposed of in terms of the reservation policy dated



15.05.2015, instructions dated 14.05.2018 as well as the judgment rendered by the Division Bench of this Court passed in CWP No.11073 of 2015 titled as 'Dinesh Kumar and another Vs. State of Haryana' decided on 07.12.2019 (Annexures P-15 to P-17, respectively).

2. Learned counsel for the parties are *ad idem* that the issue involved in the present petitions stands concluded by the judgment rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in 'Jarnail Singh and others Vs. Lachhmi Narain Gupta and ohters' 2018 (10) SCC 396.

3. The Division Bench of this Court has made the following observations in ***Dinesh Kumar' case (supra):-***

'In this petition, the petitioners have challenged the constitutional validity of the notification dated 15.05.2015 on the ground that the same is in violation of the law laid down by the Supreme Court in the case of M. Nagaraj Vs Union of India (2006) 8 SCC 212.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the issue involved in the present petition stands concluded by the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of Jarnail Singh and others Vs Lachhmi Narain Gupta & others, 2018(10) SCC 396.

The petition is accordingly disposed of in view of the decision of the Supreme Court rendered in Jarnail Singh's case (supra) subject to any order passed in review by the Supreme Court itself.'

4. Accordingly, nothing much survives for adjudication by this Court in view of the Constitution Bench judgment rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Jarnail Singh's case (supra)*** read with Division Bench judgment *ibid*, the present bunch consisting of six cases is disposed of with a direction to the respondents to pass



fresh orders in light of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court within a period of four months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

5. Needless to say, if any adverse orders are passed, the petitioner(s) would be at liberty to challenge the same.

6. Pending miscellaneous applications, if any, shall also stand disposed of.

7. A photo copy of this order be placed on the file of connected cases.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

14.10.2025

Neha

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