

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

CWP No.16434 of 2015

Date of Decision :16.11.2015

Suman Yadav

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE MAHESH GROVER

Present: Mr.Mukesh Yadav, Advocate
for the petitioner.

.....

MAHESH GROVER. J.

The petitioner prays for an appropriate direction to be issued limiting the process of interview to the incumbents who had responded to the advertisement in the year 2013 and not enlarge it to all who became eligible in the subsequent advertisement of 2015.

The case of the petitioner is that two posts were advertised in the year 2013 against which there were 9 applicants including the petitioner. For some reason the process was not carried forward and therefore again the advertisement was issued in the year 2015. The petitioner contends that only the 9 applicants who had applied in the year 2013 should have been considered against the advertisement of 2015 and by enlarging the arena to include more candidates for the process of selection has

prejudicially affected her chances of getting employment considering the fact that earlier she was competing only with 9 candidates. The facts as disclosed in the petition reveal that one of the candidates of the earlier process of 2013 had filed a writ petition bearing No.27368 of 2013 where one post was directed to be kept reserved and in the wake of the advertisement of 2015 the petitioner therein was permitted to be interviewed.

On due consideration of the matter, I am of the opinion that the instant petition is without any merit. If the respondents did not carry out the process in the year 2013, they were well within their right to do so. The petitioner, who has no right in her favour, cannot insist that the process be limited only to 9 candidates who were the applicants in the year 2013 particularly when more candidates had become eligible by the time the fresh advertisement in the year 2015 was issued. An applicant desirous of employment would have no enforceable right till the time it is crystalized. Mere application does not give any right to an individual.

No ground to interfere.

Dismissed.

16.11.2015
dss

(MAHESH GROVER)
JUDGE