

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 9720 of 2011

Date of decision:4.11.2016

Kimti Lal

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana & ors.

... Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV NARAIN RAINA

Present: None for the petitioner.

Ms. Shruti Jain Goyal, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. RK Malik, Sr. Advocate, with
Ms. Rimple Kadyan, Advocate,
for respondents No.4, 6, 9 to 12 and 14 to 20.

RAJIV NARAIN RAINA, J.(Oral)

Neither has any one appeared for the petitioner nor any pass over is sought. I find no justification in ordering an adjournment in the interest of justice since the matter is covered by a judgment of this Court in the case of the petitioner himself, as explained below.

The petitioner was a contestant for the post of Junior Engineer (Civil) in the Development and Panchayat Department, Haryana, against the advertisement No.3/2009 published by the Haryana Staff Selection Commission, Panchkula. He also applied under advertisement No.2/2009 in PWD (B&R) Department, Haryana, for similar post also notified by the Haryana Staff Selection Commission by direct recruitment. In both the recruitment processes, the criteria of selection was the same, which was a sum total of 75 marks consisting of 50 marks for academic excellence and 25 marks for viva-voce. The petitioner remained unsuccessful in both the

processes and has approached this Court in two separate petitions claiming appointment, in the present petition, and in another writ petition filed by him i.e. CWP No.8767 of 2011 (Kimti Lal v. State of Haryana & ors.) listed with this case. Meanwhile, the same has been dismissed by the learned Single Judge by an elaborate order passed on May 3, 2016. The said order has been brought to my notice both by learned Law Officer and by Mr. R.K. Malik, learned Senior counsel appearing for the non-official respondents, the selected candidates appointed to the posts against the vacancies advertised. Learned Single Judge has considered the law from every possible angle and found no merit in the petition. The present petition is based on the same grounds of challenge and therefore, the case would eminently be covered by the decision of the Coordinate Bench in the case of the petitioner himself in the aforesaid writ petition. I have no reason to take a different view to that expressed articulately by the coordinate Bench and consequently, this petition is dismissed being a case covered by the aforesaid judgment.

(RAJIV NARAIN RAINA)
JUDGE

4.11.2016
monika

Whether speaking/reasoned *Yes*

Whether reportable *No*