



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

129

CWP-2525-1999

Date of Decision : 15.01.2026

Jaswant Singh .....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others .....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAMIT KUMAR**

Present : Mr. Manu K. Bhandari, Advocate with  
Mr. Arjun Sawhni, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Satnampreet Singh Chauhan, D.A.G., Punjab.

Ms. Alka Chatrath, Advocate with  
Ms. Jyoti Pandey, Advocate for respondent No.4.

\*\*\*\*

**NAMIT KUMAR, J. (ORAL)**

1. The petitioner has filed the instant petition under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India, seeking the following reliefs :-

(i) For issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari, quashing/setting aside the impugned appointment orders of respondent No.4 and 5 (Annexures P-14 & P-15).

(ii) For issuance of a writ of mandamus, directing the respondents to appoint the petitioner on the post of Kanungo.

2. The claim raised by the petitioner is for appointment to the post of Kanungo on priority basis on the ground that he belongs to the Scheduled Caste category and his father was an Ex-Serviceman and he submitted application dated 04.10.1997 (Annexure P-2) seeking

**CWP-2525-1999****2**

appointment to the post of Kanungo, which was recommended by the Commissioner, Faridkot Division. At the same time, the petitioner has also impugned the appointment of respondent No.4 made on 25.07.1998 (Annexure P-14) to the post of Kanungo on compassionate grounds as his father was working in Education Department. Promotion of respondent No.5 made to the post of Kanungo, vide order dated 07.01.1999 (Annexure P-15), has also been challenged by the petitioner on the ground that he was promoted against a direct quota post and at the time of promotion of respondent No.5, he was under the currency of punishment.

3. During the course of hearing, it has been brought to the notice of the Court that respondent No.5 has already retired from service on attaining the age of superannuation.

4. Since respondent No.4 was given compassionate appointment on account of death of his father, who was working as Science Master in the Education Department, as per the prevalent policy governing the appointment on compassionate basis, therefore, no fault can be found in the appointment of respondent No.4. Further, the petitioner has also no locus to challenge the promotion of respondent No.5 as the petitioner was not in service candidate and was not affected by the promotion of respondent No.5. Even otherwise, respondent No.5 has already retired from service on attaining the age of superannuation.

5. So far as the claim of the petitioner for appointment to the post of Kanungo is concerned, no rule or instruction has been brought to the notice of the Court, which confers right upon a person to claim



**CWP-2525-1999**

3

appointment on priority basis only being belonging to a reserved Category and his father being an ex-serviceman. Further, appointment can only be made in confirmity with the provisions of Articles 14 & 16 of the Constitution of India by advertising the posts and by considering the claim of all the applicants.

6. Keeping in view the above, finding no merit in the instant petition, the same is hereby dismissed, with no order as to costs.

15.01.2026

Kothiyal

**(NAMIT KUMAR)**  
**JUDGE**

Whether Speaking/reasoned Yes/No

Whether Reportable Yes/No