

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

***CWP No.22070 of 2015 (O&M)
Date of decision : 22.09.2016***

Rakesh Kumar

....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Ramesh Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Hitesh Pandit, Additional Advocate General, Haryana.

...

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA, J.

The instant petition has been filed assailing the action of the respondent-authorities in not having treated the petitioner to be eligible for the post of Sub Inspector in relation to a selection process initiated vide advertisement No.8/2015 dated 19.07.2015 issued by respondent No.2/Haryana Staff Selection Commission.

Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would contend that the issue raised in the instant petition would be squarely covered in favour of the petitioner in the light of judgment dated 03.11.2015 passed by a coordinate Bench of this Court in ***CWP No.20523 of 2015*** titled as ***Yashbir Singh and others Versus State of Haryana and others.***

The contention raised by learned counsel for the petitioner is fortified in terms of the contents of the reply filed on behalf of respondent No.2/Haryana Staff Selection Commission.

Para 2 of the reply on behalf of respondent No.2 reads as follows:

*“That in compliance with the interim order dated
14.10.2015, the petitioner submitted an application form for*

the post of Sub-Inspector of Police and provisional admit card for Physical Screening Test for the said post has been issued by the Respondent-Commission to the petitioner. It is further submitted that a CWP No.20523 of 2015 titled as Yashvir Singh Vs. State of Haryana, involving the same issue as in the present writ petition, has been allowed by this Hon'ble Court vide judgment dated 03.11.2015. Therefore, after judgment dated 03.11.2015, the case of the petitioner has been considered and the petitioner has been treated eligible for Physical Screening Test. Hence, the present writ petition has become infructuous.”

In the light of such categoric stand taken, nothing survives in the instant petition and the same is disposed of as infructuous.

Disposed of.

22.09.2016

shubham

**(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE**

- | | | |
|-----|----------------------------|-----|
| i) | Whether speaking/reasoned? | Yes |
| ii) | Whether reportable? | No |