

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-12032-2016 (O&M)

Date of Decision:-04.12.2017.

Raman Ahlawat

.....Petitioner

Versus

Union of India and others

.....Respondents

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

\*\*\*\*

Present: Mr. Shailendra Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sunil Kumar Sharma, Senior Panel counsel for  
Union of India-respondents.

\*\*\*\*

**P.B. BAJANTHRI, J. (Oral)**

In the instant writ petition, petitioner has challenged the communication dated 06.05.2016 (Annexure P-10).

Respondents have notified inviting applications from the eligible candidates for the post of Constable (GD) on 05.02.2011. Petitioner was a candidate for recruitment to the post of Constable (GD). He was subjected to physical, written and medical examination during the month of April, June and July, 2011, respectively. During medical examination, they have found that there was large cyst on prepuce of penis of the petitioner. Consequently, respondents directed petitioner to produce medical certificate. Petitioner got minor surgery in respect of cyst and submitted certificate on 29.07.2011 which was stated to have been received by the

respondents on 02.08.2011. The official respondents disputed relating to receipt of medical certificate dated 29.07.2011. Thereafter, the petitioner kept quiet for about 4 years. In the year 2014-15, he made certain communication with the official respondents seeking information in respect of petitioner's application dated 29.07.2011, wherein he had enclosed a medical certificate issued by Dr. B.D. Chaudhary dated 18.05.2016. Since there is a delay and laches on the part of petitioner in seeking relief in respect of selection and appointment question of entertaining the present petition do not arise. Supreme Court in the case of **P.S. Sadasivaswamy vs The State Of Tamil Nadu 1975 SCC (1) 152** has held that in case of selection, appointment, seniority and promotion, one must approach at the earliest within a reasonable period of six months to 1 year. Whereas in the present case 4 years of laches on the part of petitioner. In view of these facts and circumstances, petitioner has not made out a case so as to interfere with Annexure P-10 dated 6.5.2016.

Petition stands dismissed.

**(P.B. BAJANTHRI)**  
**JUDGE**

**December 04, 2017.**

sandeep

Whether speaking/reasoned:-

Yes / No

Whether Reportable:-

Yes / No.