

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 24957 of 2016
Date of Decision : 01.12.2016

Rashmi Devi

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL

Present: Mr. Vishal Nehra, Advocate for the petitioner.

Anupinder Singh Grewal, J.(Oral)

The petitioner has impugned the action of the respondents for not calling her for interview for the post of PGT (Maths).

The petitioner had applied for the post of PGT (Maths) in pursuance to Advertisement No. 4 of 2015 dated 28.06.2015 (Annexure P-1). The petitioner did not deposit the requisite fee along with the application form and, therefore, she was not permitted to take the written examination.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that in pursuance to the directions of this Court in CWP No. 22746 of 2016 titled *Satish Kumar Malik and others Vs. State of Haryana and others*, dated 15.11.2016, similarly situated candidates have been called for scrutiny of documents and, therefore, the petitioner should also be allowed to appear before the respondents for scrutiny of documents.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner.

The petitioner was not permitted to participate in the written examination for want of deposit of requisite fee along with the application

form. In the case of *Satish Kumar Malik and others Vs. State of Haryana and others(supra)*, a co-ordinate Bench of this Court had directed the respondents to conduct the scrutiny of documents of the candidates, who had qualified the written examination before calling them for interview. In terms of the criteria laid down by the Commission, candidates twice the number of advertised posts have to be called for interview. Earlier the Commission had even called the ineligible candidates for interview which jeopardized the chances of eligible candidates, who were beyond the zone of consideration.

In such circumstances, it was held that scrutiny of documents has to be carried out before calling the candidates for interview. The petitioner herein cannot derive any benefit from the directions issued in the case of *Satish Kumar Malik and others Vs. State of Haryana and others (supra)*, as the petitioner has not qualified the written examination. She has infact not even appeared in the written examination for want of deposit of application fee. The petitioner was required to deposit the application fee in the year 2015, which she had not deposited within the prescribed period. It is not possible for this Court to issue a direction to the respondents to permit the petitioner to deposit the application fee and participate in the written examination, which was conducted a year back.

Therefore, the petition being devoid of any merit stands dismissed.

December 01, 2016.

kanchan

**(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned? Yes

Whether reportable? No