



107

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-10986-2025

Date of Decision :28.08.2025

Arvind Kumar and Others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and Others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYAPresent: Mr. Cyrus, Advocate for
Mr. S.K. Malik, Advocate for the petitioners.

Ms. Tanushree Gupta, Senior Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J. (ORAL)

The petition has been filed, *inter alia*, seeking a writ of *certiorari* quashing the orders dated 13.03.2025 and 19.03.2025, Annexures P-6 and P-7, respectively, whereby the respondents have demanded summary sheets and other requisite documents for considering the petitioners for promotion to the posts of Block Education Officer, Deputy District Education Officer and District Education Officer.

2. On 05.05.2025, learned counsel for the petitioner made the following statement:

It is, *inter alia*, contended that the private respondents' appointment was withdrawn vide office order dated 26.05.2020, Annexure P-3. The same was challenged by filing CWP-7737-2020, which was admitted and the withdrawal order was stayed, vide order dated 12.06.2020. Despite the matter having not been finally decided, the Department is further promoting the private respondents, and for that purpose their cases have been called vide communications dated 13.03.2025 and 19.03.2025, Annexures P-6 and P-7.



3. On the basis of instructions received, learned State counsel made the following statement on 19.05.2025:

Learned State counsel, on instructions, contends that pursuant to the impugned orders dated 13.03.2025 and 19.03.2025, Annexures P-6 and P-7, respectively, promotions to the post of Deputy DEO have been made, vide office order dated 18.04.2025, subject to any pending litigation. However, none of the private respondents has been promoted vide these orders.

2. In these circumstances, learned counsel for the petitioners seeks an adjournment to get instructions in that regard.

She further contends that as per instructions none of the private respondents has been promoted as on date.

4. After 19.05.2025, learned counsel for the petitioners has sought repeated adjournments failing to address arguments, and the facts aforementioned have not been contradicted. Accordingly, it remains undisputed that no person junior to the petitioners has been promoted, nor has any private respondent been given promotion. In these circumstances, this Court finds no ground to entertain the petition.

5. Dismissed.

August 28, 2025

ps

**(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE**

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