

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

(1.)

CWP No.7210 of 2015
Date of Decision:- 12.05.2015.

Union of India and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

Central Administrative Tribunal, Chandigarh Bench, Chandigarh and
others

.....Respondents

(2.)

CWP No.8578 of 2015

Union of India and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

Central Administrative Tribunal, Chandigarh Bench, Chandigarh and
others

.....Respondents

(3.)

CWP No.8579 of 2015

Union of India and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

Central Administrative Tribunal, Chandigarh Bench, Chandigarh and
others

.....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA KANT
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P.B. BAJANTHRI**

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

Present: Mr. P.C. Goyal, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Shailendra Sharma, Advocate for
the caveator-respondents.

SURYA KANT, J. (ORAL)

1.) This order shall dispose of CWP Nos.7210, 8578 and 8579 of 2015 as all the writ petitions have arisen out of a common order passed by Central Administrative Tribunal, Chandigarh Bench, Chandigarh (hereinafter referred to as 'the Tribunal'). The Tribunal has directed the petitioner-Authorities to declare the result of Mate (SSK) within a period of three months on receipt of a certified copy of its order dated October 17, 2014.

2.) The necessity to issue the above stated direction arose in the following circumstances:-

3.) The petitioner department vide advertisement dated 31.12.2011, invited applications for the post of Mate (SSK). The private respondents applied and were successful in the written test. They were interviewed between 20.11.2012 to 26.11.2012 but despite 2 ½ years having passed, their result was not declared. In addition to this, the private respondents apprised the Tribunal that similar

selection process was conducted by other Zonal Chief Engineers in different Commands where appointment to all the qualified candidates have already been given. Since no material fact was disclosed before the Tribunal for withholding the result of selection except to say that the candidates have no indefeasible right to seek appointment, that the Tribunal has issued the directions in question.

4.) We have heard learned counsel for the parties. Since there are no allegations of adoption of any unfair means, malpractices, any illegal, undesirable or unethical recourse etc. to secure the selection and the delay is said to have been caused only on account of administrative exigencies, we dispose of these writ petitions with a direction to the petitioners that let the result of the selection be declared, in all circumstances, on or before 31.07.2015. The consequential action of appointment etc. shall be completed expeditiously and preferably within two months thereafter.

(SURYA KANT)
JUDGE

(P.B. BAJANTHRI)
JUDGE

May 12, 2015.

sandeep sethi