



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-16153-2001 (O&M)

SATINDER SINGH AND ANOTHER

.....Petitioners

Vs.

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.

.....Respondents

Reserved on : 13.08.2026

Pronounced on: 22.09.2026

Uploaded on: 23.09.2026

Whether only the operative part of the judgment is pronounced? NO
Whether full judgment is pronounced? YES

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUDEEPTI SHARMA

Present: Mr. Ajay Chauhan, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Ram Karan Sharma, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana

Mr. Sankalp Sagar, Advocate
for respondent Nos.2 to 4.

SUDEEPTI SHARMA J. (Oral)

1. The present writ petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for quashing impugned order dated 08.11.2000 vide which claim of the petitioner for appointment in Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited (for short BPCL) as per agreement dated 18.01.1991 was rejected.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that he is only appearing for petitioner No.1 since petitioner No.2 was minor at the time of filing the writ petition and further contends that he is not pressing the present writ petition qua petitioner No.2.

3. He further contends that respondents while acquiring their land assured the job to land owners/their dependants but vide impugned order dated 08.11.2000 wrongly rejected the claim of petitioner No.1 for appointment in



BPCL. He further contends that he is sole dependant/nominee of deceased whose land was acquired by respondents still he was not granted any job. Further that the minimum criteria for interview as per educational qualification attached with the present writ petition as Annexure P-4 is 7th standard and the petitioner was pursuing graduation, at that point of time still he was not considered. He, therefore, prays that the present writ petition be allowed.

4. Per contra, learned counsel for respondent Nos.2 to 4 argues on the lines of written statement and contends that jobs were less and number of persons whose land was acquired were more, therefore, suitable candidates who were fit for job were interviewed, selected and appointed. He further contends that petitioner No.1 was not found suitable and so far as acquisition of land is concerned compensation was granted to the land owners. He, therefore, prays that the present writ petition be dismissed.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the whole file of this case with their able assistance.

6. Before proceeding further it would be apposite here to reproduce the reply filed by respondent Nos.2 to 4.

7. The relevant portion of reply filed by respondent Nos.2 to 4 is reproduced as under :-

“4. That it is further respectfully submitted that consequent to the acquisition the respondent-management as a rehabilitation measure had considered for employment, such eligible persons whose land was acquired for the construction of LPG Bottling Plant. It is pertinent to mention here that since the number of Project Affected Persons (hereinafter referred to as 'PAPs') were many, it was decided by the respondent-management that subject to



the number of vacancies being available in the Plant, the preference in employment would be given to PAPs in descending order of the area of land acquired, subject to the nominee of such PAP and/or the land looser meeting the required eligibility criteria as laid down.

5. *That it is stated that as per the Notification issued by the Government, guidelines were issued to also give opportunity to such PAPs for their dependents to be considered for their appointment subject to their meeting the eligibility criteria and the number of vacancies available. The letter dated 18.01.1991 (Annexure P-2) lays down decision taken in the meeting by the Members of the respondent-management as well as the members of the village, which are as follows:*
 - a) *Preference shall be given to those PAPs whose land has been acquired for Piyala Plant.*
 - b) *Those would be considered as PAPs who are certified by DC/SDM.*
 - c) *While granting the jobs to PAPs the preference will be given to those whose more land has been acquired.*
All the vacant post will be filled in this manner.
 - d) *Copy of definition of PAP as defined by the Govt. of Haryana has been handed over to the village representative.*
 - e) *The employees against whom there are complaints shall reply to the letters of the company. Further action in this regard shall be taken on that basis..."*
6. *That accordingly, after the acquisition the persons whose land was acquired were identified by Tehsildar, Faridabad. A list of 118 such Project Affected Persons (PAPs) giving details of their names/father's names, area of land holding, area of land acquired, name of son/daughter/nominee and his/her relationship with the landowner was forwarded by the District Administration, Faridabad to the Director of*



Employment, Haryana, Chandigarh. The Director of Employment, Chandigarh did not agree with this list and wrote back stating that either landowner whose land had been acquired should himself be considered for employment or his/her son or daughter (married and unmarried) who was dependent on such landowner, could be considered for employment. In the meantime, representations were made to Government of Haryana, and ultimately Deputy Commissioner, Faridabad, after carrying out discreet investigation in the matter and verifying the authenticity and eligibility of the people on the list of 118 PAPs supplied earlier, submitted letter dated 22.02.1990 containing a list of 65 PAPs/their dependants. Subsequently, other names were recommended by the District Administration and an additional list of 25 persons was sent by District Authorities in respect of the land acquired for the LPG Plant. Therefore, from the above, it is apparent that the Respondent Management had a very a limited role in the identification and recommendation of land losers who were to be considered for employment as PAPs. That accordingly, the respondent- management had carried out the recruitment of PAPs, as per the initial list of 65 and 25 PAPs. It is submitted that as far as the claim of petitioner No.1-Satinder Singh is concerned, it is stated that after the aforesaid acquisition of land the District Authorities issued the aforesaid list so as to consider the land losers/their nominees for employment under the Project Affected Persons (PAPs) Category. Those nominees whose names had been sponsored by land losers featuring in the aforesaid lists were considered for employment by the deponent and those who were found suitable were appointed. Further, it is stated that neither petitioner No.1 nor his father's name appeared in any of the aforesaid list issued by the District Authorities. Hence, petitioner No.1



could not be considered to be a PAP. Subsequently, in 1997, various claims were raised for employment, following which the respondent management requested the District Authorities, Faridabad to settle these claims once and for all. Accordingly, in the process of re-verification, the name of father of petitioner no.1 was forwarded for claim as PAP for the first time, vide list from the District Authorities dated 16.07.1997.

- 7. That the deponent most respectfully submits that petitioner No.1 was asked to appear for screening round along with all relevant documents so as to be considered for employment, despite the fact that he had approached this Hon'ble Court by way of CWP-10587-1994 titled as 'Govind Ram Vs. State of Haryana'. Accordingly, after carrying out the initial scrutiny, petitioner No.1 was called for interview on 30.12.1997. The interview panel comprised of the then District Revenue Officer (DRO), Faridabad, (as a representative of the District Administration) did not find Petitioner No.1 suitable, which is why he could not be selected for employment in the Corporation. It is further submitted that as number of candidates/applicants were much more than the number vacancies, it was not possible to give appointment to all the candidates and only those who were found suitable by the Interview Panel were finally appointed.*
- 8. That Petitioner No. 1 Mr. Satinder Singh was not given any assurances regarding providing employment in case he withdrew his name from the aforesaid initial petition CWP-10587-1994 titled as 'Govind Ram Vs. State of Haryana'. It should be reiterated that this interview was undertaken despite the fact that Petitioner No. 1 was a party to the aforesaid petition. The respondent management had on receiving his name from the district authority given him a fair and reasonable chance like all other PAPs appearing*



for the interview. It is also reiterated that the vacancies which arose at the plant for which Petitioner No. 1 interviewed in 1997 were the last available vacancies after which vacancies of such nature or a requirement of such nature did not arise on the plant.

8. As per written statement reproduced above, regarding claim of petitioner No.1, it is stated that after acquisition of their land, District Authorities issued a list so as to consider the land losers/their nominees for employment under the Project Affected Persons (PAPs) Category. Those nominees whose names had been sponsored by land losers featuring in the aforesaid list were considered for employment by the respondents and those who were found suitable were appointed. Further that neither the petitioner No.1 nor his father's name appeared in any of the lists issued by District Authorities, therefore, petitioner No.1 could not be considered. Further, after petitioner No.1 approached this Court, he was called for interview on 30.12.1997 but was not found suitable, therefore, was not selected for employment in Corporation. And the number of candidates/applicants were much more than the number of vacancies. Therefore, it was not possible to give appointment to all the candidates and only those who were found suitable by interview panel were finally appointed.

10. In view of the stand taken by the respondents in the written statement, I do not find any merit in the present writ petition.

11. Accordingly, the present writ petition is **dismissed**.

12. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

22.09.2026

Ayub/Sahil

(SUDEEPTI SHARMA)
JUDGE

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