

CWP-15936 of 2017

Date of Decision: 21.07.2017

Binder Singh & Ors.

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab & Anr.

... Respondents

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

Present:- Mr. Anil Kumar Bhardwaj, Advocate
for the petitioners.

....

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.J.

Pleadings on record would indicate that vide public notice dated 31.05.2016 issued by the respondents applications were invited for recruitment of Constables in the District Police Cadre and Armed Police Cadre.

Present petitioners are stated to have submitted their applications against the reserved Scheduled Caste(M.B) category.

It is the assertion made by counsel that the petitioners were eligible and as such permitted to participate in the process of selection.

During the course of hearing counsel has adverted to the document placed on record at Annexure P-6, which is a revised provisional waiting list issued on 19.05.2017 for Armed Police Cadre, after verification of documents for the category of SC (MB). It is submitted that the names of the present petitioners figure at Sr. Nos.12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 20, 22 to 25, 11, 26 and 21 respectively in such revised provisional waiting list and the candidates who have secured a lower merit position and whose names are reflected from serial Nos.27 to 35 in the same very provisional waiting list,

have already been issued appointment letters and have joined on the post of Constable.

Counsel contends that the action of the respondent authorities in having ignored the claim of the petitioners herein in spite of securing higher merit position would be arbitrary and violative of Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution.

Without even ascertaining the correctness of the averments made in the petition and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, I deem it appropriate to dispose of the instant petition in terms of granting liberty to the petitioners to file a comprehensive representation as regards their grievance and claim within two weeks from today.

In the eventuality of any such representation being preferred, respondent No.2 would be obligated to consider the same and to take a final decision thereupon in accordance with law expeditiously and in any case within a period of two months from the date of submission of the same.

Disposed of.

21.07.2017

rimpal

(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes/No

Whether Reportable:

Yes/No