

Sr. No. 247

Date of Decision : March 30, 2015

Paramvir Singh Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab and others Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL.

* * *

To be referred to Reporters or not ?

Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ?

* * *

Present : Mr. Shashi Kumar Rattan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sushant Maini, DAG, Punjab.

* * *

DEEPAK SIBAL, J. :

In pursuance to an advertisement published in Daily Ajit dated 26.07.2014, the petitioner had made an application for consideration of his candidature for appointment as a Ward Attendant. In the advertisement, six posts of Ward Attendants were advertised, but later, as mentioned in the written statement, these posts were increased to ten. As per the

advertisement, the selection was to be made on the basis of a written test followed by an interview. The petitioner appeared in the written test and qualified the same, but as he did not appear for interview, which was conducted on 22.08.2014, his candidature was cancelled and as a result thereof, persons, who attended the interview next in merit, were considered and appointed. Against the non-consideration of his candidature, the petitioner has approached this Court through the present writ petition. The sole grievance raised on behalf of the petitioner is that no proper intimation with regard to the date, time and venue of interview was available on the website even up to late hours of 21.08.2014 and this was done by the respondent Authorities for mala fide reasons so that they could appoint their own candidates.

On the other hand, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents disputes the submissions made on behalf of the petitioner. It is submitted that not only was the information with regard to interview posted on the website on 21.08.2014, but much before that, on 20.08.2014, all the eligible candidates were put to notice of the date, time and venue of interview through a public notice published in the Daily Ajit i.e. the same newspaper, in pursuance to which the petitioner had applied. It was further submitted that in pursuance to the above referred notices, as many as 24 candidates had appeared for interview and if they could appear, there was no reason so as to why the petitioner could not.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and with their able assistance, have also gone through the record.

In pursuance to an advertisement published in the Daily Ajit, the petitioner had applied for consideration of his candidature as a Ward Attendant. The advertisement clearly stipulated that the selection would be based on a written test followed by an interview. After the declaration of the results of the written test, all concerned were put to notice through a publication in the Daily Ajit on 20.08.2014 that the interview for the post of Ward Attendant would be held on 22.08.2014 at 10:30 A.M. The venue was also specified. This publication was in the same newspaper in pursuance to which the petitioner had earlier applied for consideration of his candidature. In addition, information with regard to the date, time and venue of the interview was also posted on the website of the respondents on 21.08.2014. In fact, the attendance sheet showing that as many as 24 candidates appeared for the interview for the post of Ward Attendant is enough to prove that all interested persons had gone through the public notice and accordingly, responded thereto. The petitioner, admittedly, for the reasons best known to him, did not go through the public notice nor the website. If as many as 24 candidates could appear in pursuance to the public notice dated 20.08.2014 and the information available on the website on 21.08.2014, then so could the petitioner. Thus, the petitioner cannot be allowed to derive any benefit of his own wrong.

It may be noticed that the interviews were held at Hoshiarpur and the petitioner also belongs to District Hoshiarpur. Thus, notice of two days was adequate for the petitioner to attend the interview.

Nothing has been brought to my notice to show that the respondents have entertained any application of any other candidate, who did not appear for the interview on the stipulated date and time. The allegations of mala fides, sought to be raised by the petitioner, are absolutely vague, have not been substantiated and have no legs to stand on.

In view of the above, finding no merit in the writ petition, I order dismissal of the same with no order as to costs.

(DEEPAK SIBAL)
JUDGE

March 30, 2015
monika