

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

CWP No.9337 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of decision: 12.05.2016

Manisha Choudhary

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM:HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RITU BAHRI

Present: Mr. Pankaj Jain, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

for Mr. P.K. Chugh, Advocate,
for the caveator.

Ritu Bahri, J.

The petitioner is seeking to quash the order dated 06.05.2016 (Annexure P-13), whereby the State of Haryana has initiated the process for offering appointments to private respondents by ignoring the claim of the petitioner.

Earlier, a petition (CWP No.7039 of 2016) filed by the petitioner was disposed of vide order dated 12.04.2016 (Annexure P-12) by giving a direction to respondent No.1 to look into the representation dated 26.03.2016 and take appropriate steps in accordance with law, within a period of three months.

Precise grievance of the petitioner is that as per the findings given in the enquiry report, she cannot be denied appointment pursuant to the judgment given in **Apurv and others Vs. State of Haryana and others**, LPA

direction to the respondents not to appoint the candidates as per letter/order dated 06.05.2016 (Annexure P-13) till they take a final decision on the representation made by the petitioner.

This prayer of the petitioner cannot be accepted because LPA No.1168 was disposed of by this Court as per the decision taken by the Government of Haryana that the candidates, who had been found innocent in the Vigilance report, would be offered appointment. Moreover, the case of the petitioner is already under consideration pursuant to the order dated 12.04.2016 (Annexure P-12) passed by this Court. A similar petition i.e. CWP No.7040 of 2016, titled as **Anirudh Sharma Vs. State of Haryana and another**, was decided by this Court vide order dated 12.04.2016, whereby the petitioner had made a statement that he does not want to challenge the selection of the selected candidates. The said petition was disposed of by giving direction to the respondents to decide the representation of the petitioner by passing a speaking order, within a period of three months. In that case, petitioner-Anirudh Sharma was also seeking appointment on the basis of enquiry report, according to which, he was not a tainted candidate.

Since the selection of the selected candidates is not being interfered in the case of similarly situated persons, this petition, at this stage, is being disposed of with a direction to the respondents to decide the representation (Annexure P-11) of the petitioner by passing a speaking order within a period of three months, in accordance with law.

12.05.2016
ajp

(RITU BAHRI)
JUDGE