

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

Sr. No.113

**CWP No.2554 of 2016
Date of decision: 09.02.2016**

Monika

....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL

Present: Mr. Dalbir Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

* * *

DEEPAK SIBAL, J. (Oral)

The petition lacks material particulars as the advertisement in pursuance to which the private respondents were appointed has not been annexed. Even no details with regard to their appointments have been furnished. The petitioner has also not disclosed, though admitted at the time of hearing that she took part in the selection process in pursuance to the advertisement published in July/August, 2015. Thus, the petitioner by making limited disclosures has not come to the Court with clean hands and accordingly as per settled law, has dis-entitled herself to be even heard on merits.

Even otherwise, till April 2015, the petitioner was working as an Extension Lecturer in Computer Science, Government College, Jind, Haryana. Thereafter, as submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner there was an advertisement for making fresh appointments of Extension Lecturers. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner

applied in pursuance to such advertisement but was not selected and appointed and in her place the private respondents were appointed. These appointments for the session 2015-16 were made in July/August, 2015.

Once the petitioner accepted the terms of the advertisement by participating in the selection conducted in pursuance thereto, after rejection of her candidature, now cannot turn out to challenge the appointments by saying that she could not have been replaced by another set of Extension Lecturers especially at this stage when the appointments of the private respondents for the session 2015-16 are virtually at the end of the term.

Dismissed.

(DEEPAK SIBAL)
JUDGE

February 09, 2016

Jyoti 1