

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

**Civil Writ Petition No. 17300 of 2013(O&M)
Date of Decision: 13.1.2015**

Rajesh Kumar

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

.....Respondents.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK

Present : Mr. Mahender Singh Chahal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ashok Singh Chaudhary, Additional A.G. Haryana.

RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK J.

Petitioner seeks quashing of the communication dated 16.7.2013 (Annexure P-3), whereby he was allotted roll No. 12031840 in place of earlier allotted roll No. 12031839, vide Annexure P-9.

Notice of motion was issued and pursuant thereto, written statement was filed on behalf of the respondents.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that as per the result of selected candidates contained in Annexure P-4, it was the petitioner who has been selected under roll No. 12031839 in the general category, as pointed out in page 26 of the paper book. He further submits that in this view of the matter, petitioner ought to have been treated as selected candidate and the respondent authorities

were duty bound to issue appointment order in his favour. He prays for allowing the writ petition.

Per contra, learned counsel for the State refers to communication dated 20.3.2013 (Annexure R-6) addressed by respondent No.2 to the Director, C-DAC, Mohali, clarifying the issue of allotment of wrong roll number to the petitioner. He submits that inadvertently the petitioner was allotted roll No. 12031839 incorrectly, but the said mistake was got clarified before declaration of result. He further submits that it was not the petitioner who was amongst the selected candidates. In fact, it was Ms. Suman Lata D/o Sh. Kanwar Singh, who was allotted this roll number 12031839 and was amongst the selected candidates. He prays for dismissal of the writ petition.

Having heard the learned counsel for the parties at considerable length, after careful perusal of record of the case and giving thoughtful consideration to the rival contentions raised, this Court is of the considered opinion that present one has not been found to be a fit case for exercising its writ jurisdiction under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India. To say so, reasons are more than one, which are being recorded hereinafter.

Letter dated 20.3.2013 which clarifies the only issue involved in the present case regarding allotment of wrong roll numbers to the petitioner and Ms. Suman Lata, reads as under:-

*"The Secretary,
Haryana School Teachers Selection Board,
Hartron Bhawan, Bays No. 73-76,
Sector-2, Panchkula.*

To

*The Director,
C-DAC, Mohali*

Memo No.2/11/2013-HSTSB-1SR

Dated, Panchkula, the 20th March, 2013

*Subject: Regarding issue of Roll No. for the post of
PGT History, against Advt No.1/2012, Cat No.17.*

Kindly refer to the subject cited above.

*It is intimated that Roll No. 12031839 has
been already allotted to Smt. Suman Lata D/o Sh.
Kanwar Singh (Reg. No. 11702200). You are,
therefore, requested to allot Roll No. 12031840 to
Sh. Rajesh Kumar S/o Sh. Kishan Lal Reg. No.
11701767, and next Roll No. to Sh. Manu Dev S/o
Sh. Zile Singh Reg No. 11701250.*

*Sd-
Secretary,
Haryana School Teachers Selection Board
Panchkula"*

It is a matter of record and not in dispute that the petitioner participated in the selection process and appeared in the interview, but could not make the benchmark. Result of the selection came to be declared on 10.4.2013 vide Annexure P-4. Thus, it becomes crystal clear that issue of allotment of roll numbers to the petitioner as well as to Ms. Suman Lata was clarified before declaration of the result. It is not even the pleaded or argued case on behalf of the petitioner that his roll number was wrongly allotted to Ms. Suman Lata. In this view of the matter, it can be safely concluded that no prejudice of any kind, whatsoever, has been caused to the petitioner.

Had the issue of allotment of roll numbers to the petitioner as well as to Ms. Suman Lata, been not clarified and resolved before declaration of the result, vide Annexure R-3, then the petitioner might have some case in his favour. However, since the only issue

involved in the present case has already been clarified vide abovesaid letter dated 20.3.2014, the action of the respondent authorities cannot be said to either arbitrary or discriminatory and the same deserves to be upheld, for this reason also.

No other argument was raised.

Considering the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case noted above, coupled with the reasons aforementioned, this Court is of the considered view that present writ petition is wholly misconceived, bereft of merit and without any substance. Thus, it must fail. No case for interference has been made out.

Resultantly, instant writ petition stands dismissed, however, with no order as to costs.

(RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK)
JUDGE

13.1.2015
AK Sharma