

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 24628 of 2016

Date of Decision:30.11.2016

Ramesh & Anr

...Petitioners

Vs.

Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Ltd. & Anr.

...Respondents

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

Present:- Ms. Alka Chatrath, Advocate
for the petitioners.

RAJIV NARAIN RAINA, J. (Oral

From the table made in para 22 of the petition, Ms. Alka Chatrath, learned counsel argues that the petitioners who belong to SC category are higher in merit than Narveer, Devender, Vijender who have been offered appointment as Assistant Linesman in August, 2016 in the respondent-Nigam. The petitioners have been selected at merit No.32 and 31 respectively and the candidates lower in merit namely; the candidates Sr. No.172, 232 & 291 belonging to SC Category have been appointed.

When asked how has this happened, Ms. Chatrath submits that in cases of the present kind that the respondent- Nigam offers appointment when directed by Court. This is a rather interesting way of settling rights of candidates who are higher in merit in the category.

If this is the position then there is no need to issue summons and put the Nigam to notice only to perpetuate a bad habit formed in the Nigam to go by Court orders alone with no sanctity attached to merit in the selection process.

In the circumstances, Ms. Chatrath's contentions appear to be weighty that the petitioner's demand notice dated October 15, 2016 (P-18) deserves to be paid attention to by the authorities in the Nigam.

Accordingly, a direction is issued to the respondents to take up the demand notice forthwith, examine the case of above-said selected candidates as against the case of the petitioners and accord them parity of treatment according to their merit position. Let this exercise be completed within a fortnight and in case, the petitioners deserve appointment according to their merit position in the category applied for, then they would be offered consideration for appointment within the next three weeks after completing the formalities.

With these observations and directions, the petition stands disposed of.

(RAJIV NARAIN RAINA)
JUDGE

30.11.2016

neeraj

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No