



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

463 (4 Cases)

CWP-5573-2005

Date of Decision: 21.08.2025

S.I. Gurmeet Singh and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

With

Sr. No.	Case No.	Petitioner(s)	Respondent(s)
2.	CWP-5657-2005	SI Rajinder Singh and another	State of Punjab and others
3.	CWP-17407-2007	SI Pargat Singh and others	State of Punjab and others
4.	CWP-6130-2003 (O&M)	Head Constable Baldev Singh and others	State of Punjab and others

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present: - Mr. Naresh Kumar, Advocate
for Mr. K.S. Dadwal, Advocate for the petitioners
(in CWP No.6130-2003)

Mr. K.G. Chaudhary, Advocate for the petitioners
(in CWP No.17407 of 2007)

Mr. Aman Dhir, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)

1. As common issues are involved in the captioned petitions, with the consent of both sides, the same are hereby disposed of by this common order. For the sake of brevity and convenience, facts are borrowed from CWP-5573-2005.

2. On 05.04.2005, this Court passed the following order: -

“Learned counsel for the petitioners states that the Punjab Armed Police and police cadre at the district level are separate and distinct from one another. He further states that at the time of the transfer of the petitioners from the Punjab Armed Police to the District Police Cadre, the petitioners were required to file affidavits asserting that they were ready



and willing to forego the seniority earned by them as a consequence of having worked with Punjab Armed Police. Additionally, it is stated that the petitioners were required to file affidavits to the effect that on their re-transfer the District Police Cadre to the Punjab Armed Police, they will not be entitled to count their services rendered in the District Police Cadre for the purposes of seniority.

Notice of motion.

Notice re: stay as well.

On our asking, Mr. S.S. Behl, Additional Advocate General, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3.

Learned counsel for the respondents seeks an adjournment so as to enable him to file written statement. Prayer is allowed. Written statement, if any, be filed within four weeks from today with a copy in advance to learned counsel for the petitioners.

List again on 23.5.2005.”

3. Learned counsel for the parties submit that joint seniority list was prepared as per directions of this Court passed in judgment dated 16.12.2014 in ***SI Pardeep Singh and others v. State of Punjab and others, CWP No.4829 of 2011***. They further submit that petitioners have retired on attaining the age of superannuation.

4. In the wake of statement of both sides, the present petitions stand disposed of with liberty to petitioners to move an appropriate application within three months from today, if cause survives.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

21.08.2025
Mohit Kumar

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