

CWP No.4923 of 2013
Date of Decision: 23.07.2016

Ranjit Singh **Petitioner**

Versus

Staff Selection Commission (NWR) and others Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P. B. BAJANTHRI

Present: Mr. Amandeep Singh Cheema, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Naveen Chopra, Advocate
for respondent No.1.

Mr. Indresh Goel, Advocate
for respondents No.2 to 10.

P. B. BAJANTHRI J. (ORAL)

In the present petition, the petitioner has sought for quashing of the order dated 09.01.2013 (Annexure P-5) and further sought a direction to respondent No.1 to recommend the name of the petitioner for appointment to the post of Constable (GD) pursuant to the advertisement dated 03.12.2011 (Annexure P-1) in the Scheduled Caste category since respondents No.2 to 10 have secured lesser marks than the petitioner in the Scheduled Caste category.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that even though he was more merited than respondents No.2 to 10 but his name has not been considered for selection and appointment to the post of Constable (GD). The records be summoned to verify whether lower merited persons under Scheduled Caste category have been selected and appointed. Perusal of the records it is true that lower merited candidates than the petitioner have been selected and appointed in the Scheduled

Caste category. The reason for non-selection/appointment of the petitioner is that he failed to exercise option by filling the application form in particularly "item No.16". The petitioner failed to give his order of preference of post for CPO's like A,B,C,D,E,F. In the absence of filling up "item No.16" of the application form, the respondents/selecting authority and appointing authority rightly rejected the candidature of the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the respondents should have rejected his candidature at threshold before subjecting him to selection process like physical and medical fitness.

Learned counsel for the respondents submitted that since large number of applicants have applied for the post, scrutiny of applications before subjecting them for physical and medical test may not be appropriate and it was a consuming a lot of time. Therefore as and when a candidate passes physical and medical test, his application is scrutinized. In the process of scrutinizing of petitioner's application form, it was found that petitioner failed to fill column No.16 in the application form, despite candidates were instructed to exercise order of preference to various units.

In view of the facts and circumstances, the petitioner has not made a case so as to seek interference with the process of selection and appointment to the post of Constable (GD).

Petition stands dismissed.

(P. B. BAJANTHRI)
JUDGE

July 23, 2016
rittu