

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

CWP No.21493 of 2011
Date of decision: 27.07.2015

Parminder Kaur

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI

Present: Mr. Madhav Pokhrel, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Nilesh Bhardwaj, DAG, Punjab.

1. Whether reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest?

ARUN PALLI J. (Oral)

Pursuant to an advertisement dated 23.09.2009 (Annexure P10), petitioner had applied to compete against the post of Math master/mistress. Concededly, the counselling for scrutiny of the requisite documents was slated to take place on 15/16.07.2010. It is not disputed that the petitioner failed to participate in the counselling and it was after over a year on 25.10.2011 (Annexure P17), she represented to the department.

Learned counsel for the parties are ad idem that pursuant to the final declaration of the result (Annexure P14), the selections were made in the year 2011 followed by consequent appointments.

Learned counsel for the petitioner could not point out as to how, after the petitioner herself failed to participate in the counselling, she can still stake a claim for consideration of her candidature at such a belated stage.

No interference is warranted under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. Petition being devoid of merit is dismissed.

July 27, 2015
Rajan

(Arun Palli)
Judge