

CWP No. 18463 of 2015

1

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

**CWP No. 18463 of 2015.
Date of Decision : 02.09.2015.**

Hardev Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

The Registrar, Punjab University and others ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PARAMJEET SINGH

Present: Mr. S.C. Arora, Advocate for the petitioner.

Paramjeet Singh, J.(Oral)

The instant petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for quashing the appointment of respondent No. 3 working under the respondents No. 1 and 2 on the ground that he does not possess the requisite qualification for the post of peon and for a writ of mandamus to hold enquiry against the respondent No. 3.

The petitioner has filed the writ petition only on the ground that he had gone to Panjab University Regional Centre at Sri Muktsar Sahib to enquire about the admission in LL.B Course for his nephew and contacted some officials there, who in turn, advised him to check online about entrance exam. The respondent No. 3, who was watching all this took him to a side and assured him admission provided he is paid

₹25,000/-, ₹10,000/- in advance and remaining after the admission in the stream.

Be that as it may, the fact remains that the petitioner is not an aggrieved person in any manner. As far as appointment of respondent No. 3 as peon is concerned, he has never applied for the post and is not an aggrieved person against the appointment of respondent No. 3 made in 1998. Moreover, neither the petitioner has placed on record the Rules, which were applicable at the time when respondent No. 3 was appointed, nor has he disclosed whether the Rules as disclosed to him under the Right to Information Act vide letter dated 07.05.2015 (Annexure P-2) by the Panjab University, Chandigarh, were applicable to the appointment of respondent No. 3 made vide letter dated 15.07.1998 (Annexure P-3). It appears to be a mala fide on the part of the petitioner as there seems to be some dispute between the petitioner and respondent No. 3 Nishan Singh.

No ground to interfere in exercise of extraordinary writ jurisdiction.

Dismissed.

September 02, 2015.
kanchan

(PARAMJEET SINGH)
JUDGE