

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

CWP No.11340 of 2016

Date of decision: 01.06.2016

Ankur Kumar

...Petitioner

versus

Registrar Recruitment, Punjab and Haryana High Court & others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RITU BAHRI

Present: Mr. Aakash Juneja, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

RITU BAHRI, J.

The petitioner is seeking quashing of the selection list (Annexure P-6), whereby respondent Nos. 4 to 12 have been appointed as Peon(s) in the General category.

The petitioner was appointed as Peon vide appointment letter dated 11.04.2007 (Annexure P-1) and thereafter, his services have been dispensed with vide order dated 30.04.2010 (Annexure P-2). However, vide order dated 03.01.2011, he was again appointed as Peon on contract basis up till 28.02.2011. His service was extended from 28.02.2011 to 29.02.2012 and thereafter, from 29.02.2012 to 28.02.2013. Vide order dated 05.07.2013, he was again appointed on the post of Peon on contract basis up till 28.02.2014. thereafter, his services were extended from time to time and he continued to work till 06.02.2016. Pursuant to an advertisement dated 05.08.2015 (Annexure P-4) inviting applications for 9 posts of Process Servers, 15 posts of peon/addl. Peon and 1 post of sweeper for Sessions Division, Rohtak, the petitioner applied for the post of Peon in General

category. The criteria of selection was interview carrying 30 marks, which were categorized as under:-

- | | | |
|------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| 1. Suitability | : | 15 Marks |
| 2. Manner of Etiquette | : | 5 Marks |
| 3. General Awareness | : | 5 Marks |
| 4. Higher Education | : | 5 Marks (for matriculation & above). |

The petitioner participated in the selection process. The Selection Committee was consisting three Members and each Member had to give marks out of 30 marks. As per Assessment Sheet (Annexure P-7), the petitioner has been awarded 51 marks.

Grievance of the petitioner is that he had been serving as Peon since 2007 i.e. for almost 8 years and no benefit of experience has been extended while considering his case.

The petitioner was appointed on contract basis and on this account, he had a right only to appear in the regular process. Marks have been awarded to each of the candidates as per the criteria, which was based on the interview. In the absence of any allegation of irregularity or favouritism, no ground is made out to quash the impugned selection process.

Dismissed.

01.06.2016
ajp

(RITU BAHRI)
JUDGE