

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

CWP No. 18720 of 2012
Date of decision: 24.05.2016

Sukhdev Singh

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE G.S.SANDHAWALIA

Present: Mr. A.S. Khosa, Advocate,
for Mr. G.S. Kaura, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. L.S. Virk, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

G.S.SANDHAWALIA, J. (Oral)

The petitioner challenges the appointment of respondent no. 4 on the ground that he was at the wait list no. 4 for the post of Constable in the Punjab Police in B.C. category.

It is his case that the said respondent had wrongly been accommodated whereas, he was at wait list no. 1 and the said respondent was last in the wait list as per Annexure P-7.

The defence of the State was that the person at wait list no. 1 had been appointed and the name of the petitioner was actually at sr. no. 4 in the wait list according to the actual merit list prepared by the Recruitment Board. The District Police had not shown correct merit list, on the basis of which, the claim of the petitioner was based. Annexure R-1 was appended to show that the petitioner had got 26-1/2 marks whereas, the private respondent had got 27 marks. Accordingly, the record had been summoned.

It was rightly pointed out by the counsel for the State that there was discrepancy in showing the wait list in the said category and the petitioner was at sr. no. 4 but had been shown at sr. no. 1 whereas, the private respondent who was to be shown at sr. no. 1 was shown at sr. no. 4, on the basis of which, the petitioner's claim is based.

After examining the record, this Court is of the opinion that in view of the mistake as such whereby the roll numbers were shown in the wait list, there is no illegality as such. The respondents have operated the wait list on the basis of merit of the candidates. It is further stated that the selection process has closed down and, therefore, the petitioner is not entitled for consideration. Even otherwise, there are two persons over and above him in merit.

Accordingly, there is no merit in the present writ petition and the same is dismissed.

24.05.2016
shivani

(G.S. SANDHAWALIA)
JUDGE