

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

**CWP No.14214 of 2015
Date of decision: 21.07.2015**

Satish Kumar ... Petitioner
Vs.

State of Haryana and others ... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

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

Present:- Mr. B.S.Sewak, Advocate
for the petitioner.

AMIT RAWAL J.

Petitioner has knocked the door of this Court seeking mandamus for appropriate direction to the respondents to allow the petitioner to give thumb impression for verification for the post of Primary Teacher, Category No.1, issued in pursuance to the Advertisement No.2/2012 , Annexure P-1, for verification and scrutiny of the documents-cum-interview.

Mr. B.S.Sewak, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in pursuance to the advertisement, the petitioner after submission of the application, appeared for interview on 17.7.2013 and merit list was circulated by the Haryana School Teachers Selection Board and the name of the petitioner was shown in the merit list at serial number 8961 with the remarks 'Waiting'. In the

month of March 2015, the respondents had initiated the process for taking thumb impression of all the selected candidates including of those whose name were appeared in the waiting list. However, the petitioner was seriously fell ill and due to his illness, he could not give thumb impression for verification and in support of that, petitioner filed representation along with medical certificates, Annexures P-6 to P-8 and thus, prays that owing to health condition, petitioner could not give thumb impression. After medical certificate, the fitness certificate was also given w.e.f. 21.03.2015.

There is no averment, much less, pleading which prevented the petitioner to give thumb impression in the month of March 2015. Thereafter, the petitioner is stated to have fallen ill in the month of May, 2015 and submitted a representation in the same month. Since the pleadings are wanting material particularly with regard to as to how the petitioner was prevented from giving his thumb impression after 21.03.2015. The petitioner cannot be permitted to press this plea for giving his thumb impression when the process of thumb impression has already been completed.

In view of what has been observed above, the claim of the petitioner is fully fallacious and totally mis-conceived.

Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed.

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

July 21, 2015
savita