



114

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-21633-2025

Date of Decision: 30.07.2025

ASI/LR AMRIT SINGH AND OTHERS ..... Petitioners

*Versus*

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS ..... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL**

Present : Mr. Krishan Kumar Thakur, Advocate with  
Mr. Paras Khindri, Advocate and  
Mr. G.S. Brar, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Aman Dhir, DAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*\*

**JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)**

1. The petitioners through instant petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India are seeking setting aside of impugned letter dated 15.07.2025 whereby DGP has asked ADGP to send a list of 20% employees of PAP, IRB and Commando to be repatriated to their parent departments.

2. The petitioners are working with Intelligence Wing of Punjab Police on deputation basis. Their parent department is either PAP or IRB or Commando. The respondent by impugned order has desired to repatriate 20% employees to their parent department.

3. Mr. Krishan Kumar Thakur, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners are working with Intelligence Wing for almost one decade. They cannot be repatriated without complying with standing order No.3 of 2017 issued by respondent. There is no



allegation of misconduct against them and respondent is not following the procedure prescribed by aforesaid standing order.

4. Mr. Aman Dhir, DAG, Punjab, who on advance notice is present in Court, submits that instant petition is premature because till date list of employees to be repatriated has not been finalized. There is need of officers in their parent cadres, thus, DGP has decided to repatriate them from Intelligence Wing. The respondent while finalizing the matter would take care of standing order pointed out by respondent as well as interim orders passed by Division Bench of this Court in CWP-6737-2022, order dated 06.03.2024 passed by this Court in CWP-19966-2017 apart from statutory provisions. The impugned communication is an administrative decision.

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

6. From the perusal of impugned communication, it is evident that it, at least at this stage, is an administrative decision. No final decision has been arrived at by the competent authority. As contended by learned State counsel, the respondent would take final decision after complying with applicable Rules, Regulations as well as standing orders.

7. Disposed of in above terms.

( JAGMOHAN BANSAL )  
JUDGE

30.07.2025

*Ali*

Whether speaking/reasoned  
Whether Reportable

Yes/No  
Yes/No