

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

**CWP No.4391 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 10.08.2016**

Sidharath Mehla and others

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

CWP No.9273 of 2016 (O&M)

Upasana

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

CWP No.11040 of 2016 (O&M)

Gurmeet Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA

Present:- Mr. Madan Pal, Advocate and
Mr. Ivneet Singh Pabla, Advocate,
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Rajesh Gaur, Additional A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Deepak Sabherwal, advocate,
for respondents No. 2 to 6.

Mr. H.N.Mehtani, Advocate,
for respondent No.7.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA, J.(ORAL)

This order shall dispose of CWP Nos.4391 of 2016 titled as
Sidharath Mehla and others Vs. State of Haryana and others, CWP No.9273
of 2016 titled as Upasana Vs. State of Haryana and others and CWP
No.11040 of 2016 titled as Gurmeet Singh Vs. State of Haryana and others.

The petitioners in these bunch of three petitions were applicants for the post of either Assistant Engineer (A.E.) or Junior Engineer (J.E.) in different streams. Some of the petitioners belonged to general category whereas others belonged to the reserved category.

These petitioners had been permitted to appear in a written examination provisionally by way of interim directions issued by this Court.

It would not be necessary to go into the facts and details of each case as these writ petitions have been rendered infructuous on account of following circumstances:

Mr. Deepak Sabherwal, Advocate, appearing for contesting respondents No. 2 to 6 has brought the result of all the petitioners herein and the same has been opened in the Court by the Bench Secretary.

Counsel for the petitioners have been permitted by the Court to see the result sheet to know the fate of their clients and after perusal of the result sheet, the same has been handed back to the officials who had come to Court from the respondent Corporation.

Mr. Sabherwal, submits that in the written examination, a bench mark had been stipulated for qualifying the written examination i.e. 50% for general category and 45% for reserved category for both the posts i.e. Assistant Engineer as well as Junior Engineer. He further clarifies that a candidate upon achieving the bench mark was eligible to be called for the interview subject to a process of shortlisting by applying a ratio of 1:2. In other words, if 100 candidates belonging to the general category achieved the bench mark of 50% in the written test, the top 50 candidates were to be called for the interview. Same process of shortlisting was applicable to the reserved category and in relation to both the posts of Assistant Engineer and

Junior Engineer.

Mr. Sabherwal apprises the Court that while applying the ratio of 1:2 in the process of shortlisting, none of the petitioners has achieved marks towards the cut off that has been applied.

Counsel appearing for the petitioners have been shown the result of the test and they are not in a position to dispute such factual stand and assertion made by the counsel appearing for the Corporation.

In view of such factual position, these petitions have been rendered infructuous and are dismissed accordingly.

10.08.2016

vandana

(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No