



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

RSA-2952-2025 (O&M)

Date of Reserve:- 28.08.2025

Date of Pronouncement:-04.09.2025

Manjit Singh

.....Appellant

vs.

Punjab State Through Dy. Commissioner & ors.

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUDEEPTI SHARMA

Present: Mr. Harkaran Singh, Advocate
for the appellant.

Mr. Animesh Sharma, Addl.A.G. Punjab.

SUDEEPTI SHARMA J.

1. The present regular second appeal is preferred against judgment and decree dated 14.10.2022 passed by learned Addl. Civil Judge (Senior Division), Mansa whereby the civil suit for compensation filed by the appellant was dismissed and judgment and decree dated 19.02.2025 whereby the appeal filed by the appellant against the judgment and decree dated 14.01.2022, was also dismissed by learned District Judge, Mansa.

FACTS NOT IN DISPUTE

2. Brief facts of the case as per civil suit are that the civil suit for compensation of Rs.3,00,000/- was filed by the appellant stating therein that the respondents did not provide proper intimation regarding employment to the appellant. Further that he was not informed regarding vacancies advertised by the respondents/State Government from time to time because of which the appellant suffered financial loss to the tune of Rs.3,00,000/-. Further the appellant crossed



the maximum age of employment due to wrong act and conduct of the respondents, since the appellant was not informed regarding the vacancies available with the respondents/State.

SUBMISSIONS OF LEARNED COUNSEL FOR THE APPELLANT

3. Learned counsel for the appellant contends that the appellant had to bear loss because of non information/intimation by the respondents/State regarding the number of vacancies advertised by the respondents/State. He further submits that because of the non intimation by the respondents, the appellant crossed the maximum age to apply for the post. He, therefore, prays that the present Regular second appeal be allowed.

4. Per contra, learned counsel for the respondents argues on the lines of judgment and decree passed by both the Courts below and contends that the civil suit for compensation filed by the appellant has rightly been dismissed. He, therefore, prays that the present Regular second appeal be dismissed.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the whole record of this case with their able assistance.

6. A perusal of the record shows that admittedly, the appellant preferred CWP No. 6465-1998 before this Court, which was dismissed vide order/judgment dated 27.01.1999. The appellant while appearing as PW1 admitted in his cross examination regarding filing of the above writ petition and the decision thereof. Harpreet Singh Manshahia was examined as DW1, who stated that the appellant had earlier filed civil suit which was also dismissed. This was admitted by the appellant as well in his cross examination.



ANALYSIS OF THE RECORD

7. There is nothing on record to show that the respondents/State is at fault, since the posts are always advertised and the person who is interested, he is free to apply for the same. As per pleadings in the civil suit, the appellant was matriculate and he got himself enrolled with employment office. The appellant admitted in his cross examination that he filed CWP No. 6465-1998 on the same cause of action before this Court, which was dismissed on 27.01.1999. He earlier filed civil suit bearing No. 515 of 2016 on the same cause of action, which was again admitted by him in his cross examination and the said suit was dismissed by observing that the appellant was not unemployed. Thereafter, he again filed civil suit in the year 2018 which was dismissed on 14.10.2022 and the appeal filed against the same was also dismissed on 19.02.2025 challenging which the present Regular Second Appeal is filed, which requires no interference by this Court.

CONCLUSION

7. In view of the above, I do not find any infirmity in judgment and decree dated 14.10.2022 passed by learned Addl. Civil Judge (Senior Division), Mansa as well as judgment and decree dated 19.02.2025 passed by learned District Judge, Mansa and the same are upheld. Accordingly, the present regular second appeal is dismissed.

8. Parties are left to bear their own costs. Decree sheet be prepared accordingly.

9. Pending application (s) if any also stands disposed of.

04.09.2025

Gaurav Arora

(SUDEEPTI SHARMA)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No