

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 20688 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 03.10.2016.

Anita Kumari

--Petitioner

Versus

Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Limited
and others

--Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.

Present:- Mr. Mohan Singla, Advocate for the petitioner.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.J

Pleadings on record would indicate that the Haryana Staff Selection Commission issued advertisement in the year 2011 inviting applications for recruitment to 4131 posts of Assistant Line Man.

Petitioner is stated to belong to the B.C (A) category. She had applied for the post in question and was subjected to a process of selection. In the result that was declared on 4.10.2012 petitioner's name figured in the combined waiting list at Sr. No.80 and at Sr. No.11 in the B.C.(A) category.

State Govt. issued instructions dated 2.7.2010 and 23.5.2014 at Annexures P-5 and P-6 respectively and as per which, if, candidates of Ex-service Man category are not available, then, the posts are to be diverted back to the main category.

Claim of the petitioner is that since 124 posts of Ex-service Man B.C. (A) category have remained unfilled on account of non-availability of suitable candidates, such posts are to be filled up from amongst the B.C.(A) category.

Counsel argues that similar claim was set up by other candidates, who had also participated in the same very process of selection

by filing ***CWP No.17706 of 2013 (Prem Chand and others Vs. State of Haryana and others)*** and other connected petitions and which have been allowed vide judgement dated 18.5.2016 (Annexure P-10), passed by a Coordinate Bench of this Court. It is contended that claim of the petitioner seeking appointment to the post of Assistant Line Man in the B.C. (A) category would be covered in the light of such judgement.

Without making any observations on merit, I deem it appropriate to dispose of the instant petition in terms of granting liberty to the petitioner to file a comprehensive representation as regards her claim. In the eventuality of any such representation being preferred within two weeks from today, respondents no.1 and 2 would be obligated to consider the same strictly in accordance with law and keeping in view the judgement rendered by this Court in ***Prem Chand's*** case (supra) and to take a final view thereupon, within a period of six weeks from the date of submission of the representation.

Petition disposed of.

(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE

03.10.2016

lucky

Whether speaking/reasoned: No

Whether Reportable: No