

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

2025:PHHC:112200



122

CWP-24566-2025

Date of Decision: 25.08.2025

Gurdass

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana & others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL.

Present: Mr. Lalit Rishi, Advocate for the petitioner.

.....

SANDEEP MOUDGIL.J (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Article 226 of Constitution of India praying for issuance of a writ in the nature of Certiorari quashing the impugned tentative seniority list of SEPOs as on 01.08.2024 circulated by respondent no.2 vide letter dated 22.08.2024 (Annexure P-9), whereby petitioner has been wrongly placed much lower than his actual entitlement.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner would contend that petitioner was appointed as Gram Sachiv with the Department of Development and Panchayats, Haryana on 01.03.1993 and was subsequently promoted as Social Education and Panchayat Officer (SEPO) on 27.11.2019 (Annexure P-1).

3. Thereafter, department made direct recruitments to the said post of S.E.P.O placing such direct recruits over and above the petitioner, to which the petitioner disputed by making a representation, though,

respondent no.4, B.D.P.O, Ambala forwarded the petitioner's case to respondent no.3, who in furtherance thereof recommended the case to respondent no.2 along with A.C.Rs of the petitioner. A tentative seniority list was prepared on 03.02.2022 qua the cadre of S.E.P.Os showing the petitioner at Sr. No.56. It is further averred on behalf of the petitioner that respondent no.2, thereafter, sent a proposal for promotion to the post of B.D.P.O to respondent no.1 along with seniority list, which was returned noting errors in tentative seniority list vide letter dated 11.03.2022 (Annexure p-6). Accordingly, a new tentative seniority list was prepared on 22.03.2022 (Annexure P-7) showing the petitioner down in the seniority list to no.96 and an objection to the same was submitted by the petitioner and claimed himself over and above one Hukam Chand and Harish Kumar. The said objection of petitioner was considered and he was provided with opportunity of personal hearing and correction was made in the tentative seniority list on 01.08.2024 which was circulated showing the petitioner at Sr. No.82, though the petitioner still claimed himself to be senior and should have been at Sr. No.16.

4. Thereafter, without finalizing the seniority list, it is averred that vide letter dated 13.08.2025 record has been called by respondent no.1 regarding S.E.P.Os situated at Sr. Nos. 1 to 32 in the tentative seniority list for considering them for promotion to the post of B.D.P.O.

5. It is against this action of the respondents, the petitioner being aggrieved has invoked the jurisdiction of this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking quashing of impugned tentative seniority list circulated by respondent no.2 vide letter dated 22.08.2024 (Annexure P-9) being incorrect as the petitioner is supposed to be at Sr. No.16 but has not

been given the right seniority.

6. In addition to that petitioner has further prayed for staying the process of promotion in compliance to the record summoned by respondent no.1 to make promotions to the post of B.D.P.Os.

7. Notice of motion.

8. Mr. Sushil Bhardwaj, Addl. A.G., Haryana accepts notice on behalf of respondents no.1 and 2.

9. Learned State counsel assures the Court that matter is pending for the last one year and there is no inclination to make promotions, at this stage, to the post of B.D.P.Os without finalizing the tentative seniority list. He has also undertaken before this Court that no promotions to the post of B.D.P.O would be made without finalizing the tentative seniority list circulated on 22.08.2024 (Annexure P-9) without considering the objections so submitted by the petitioner.

10. In the light of the above position, learned counsel for the petitioner having left with no other grievance for inviting further indulgence and interference of this Court, does not press the instant petition and seeks withdrawal of the same.

11. The present petition is, accordingly, disposed of as withdrawn.

25.08.2025

lucky

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No