

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

**CWP No.11818 of 2015 (O&M)
Date of decision: 05.08.2015.**

Ram Mehar Singh

..Petitioner

Versus

The State of Haryana and others

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE DAYA CHAUDHARY

- 1. Whether reporters of local newspapers may be allowed to see judgment? Yes/No**
- 2. To be referred to reporters or not? Yes/No**
- 3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest? Yes/No**

Present: Mr. P.L Verma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Daya Chaudhary, J. (Oral)

CM-9686-CWP-2015

This application is for placing on record Annexure P-4.

Application is allowed and Annexure P-4 is taken on
record.

CWP-11818-2015

The prayer made in the present writ petition is for quashing of order dated 09.08.2012 (Annexure P-3), whereby, the claim of the petitioner regarding fixation of seniority over and above his junior, namely, Om Parkash has been rejected. A prayer has also been made for issuance of direction to respondents to fix the seniority of the petitioner and to grant the consequential benefits.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the seniority list was not displayed or conveyed to the petitioner, therefore,

he could not challenge the same whereas in the impugned order it has specifically been mentioned that the petitioner was offered an opportunity of hearing on 19.06.2012 and 03.08.2012 but he could not adduce any evidence for claiming his promotion to the post of Agriculture Inspector from the date his junior, namely, Om Parkash was promoted.

On perusal of impugned order, it is apparent that the petitioner did not make any representation or challenged the promotion order dated 21.05.1973, whereby, his junior, namely, Om Parkash was promoted.

It is also mentioned that the seniority list was finalized and was issued on 31.03.1992 and 01.01.2005. Neither any representation was made nor any objection was ever raised by the petitioner. The petitioner as well as his junior, namely, Om Parkash have retired and now after passing of more than 23 years after the issuance of list of year 1992 and 10 years after the issuance of list of year 2005, the representation has been filed, which has been rejected.

The impugned order contains specific findings and reasons and the same has been passed after affording sufficient opportunity of hearing to the petitioner so no case is made out on merit.

Hence, the present writ petition being devoid of any merit is hereby dismissed.

05.08.2015

neetu

**(DAYA CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE**