

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.20402 of 2015

Date of Decision: 24.09.2015

Navneet Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV NARAIN RAINA

Present: Mr. Parvesh K.Saini, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

1. To be referred to the Reporters or not?
2. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

RAJIV NARAIN RAINA, J.

It is the contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner that this matter is covered by the decision of this Court in CWP No.18419 of 2013, *Harinder Pal Singh vs. State of Punjab and others* decided on November 03, 2014.

The only distinction is that in the present case, the posts on which the appointment is sought is that of Junior Engineer (Civil) whereas in the aforesaid case post involved was Junior Engineer (Mechanical) but both were part and parcel of the same recruitment process and common merit list.

The petitioner has secured higher merit than the last reserved category candidate by point 5 (80.5% as against 80%).

While allowing the aforesaid writ petition, I had imposed costs of Rs.25,000/- after hearing the State. Since costs have been imposed in the

aforesaid case for elaborate reasons recorded in the order dated November 03, 2014 I would impose the same cost ex parte on the State in favour of a person similarly placed who also has been compelled to approach this Court for relief. If there are reasons other than based on the percentage of marks and higher merit then the costs will not be required to be paid to the petitioner and the State would remain at liberty to pass an appropriate order.

With this, the petition is allowed in terms of the orders passed in CWP No.18419 of 2013 subject to above caveat.

The State is at liberty to apply in the disposed of petition in case the facts are otherwise.

(RAJIV NARAIN RAINA)
JUDGE

24.09.2015
manju