

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.20566 of 2017

Date of Decision: September 11, 2017

Ashwani Kumar and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present:- Mr. Ajay Chaudhary, Advocate, for the petitioners.

Amol Rattan Singh, J. (Oral)

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the result of the written examination conducted pursuant to the advertisement, Annexure P-1, in which the last closing date for submission of application forms was 31.07.2015, was declared on 09.05.2017, and three times the number of candidates to be appointed were to be called for interview, in terms of the notification of the Haryana Government, dated 11.08.2017 (Annexure P-8).

In view of the fact that the result of the written examination was declared in May 2017 and the notification in which it has been stipulated that three times (instead of twice) the number of candidates to be appointed are to be called for interviews, having been issued on 11.08.2017, the petitioners, in the opinion of this Court would have no ground to seek the benefit of the aforesaid notification, that issue having already been settled against the petitioners in that petition on 29.08.2017, by a coordinate Bench of this Court, in CWP no.18878 of 2017 titled as **Sukhbir Singh and others v. State of Haryana and others**, with the LPA against that judgment

also stated to have been dismissed, as per Mr. Doon, learned Assistant Advocate General, Haryana, upon a query made by this Court.

Though the selection process in the present case remained pending for more than 2 years, the fact that the result of the written examination was declared in May 2017, would be crucial to the issue raised by the petitioners in this petition, with the situation possibly being different if the result of the examination had been declared after 11.08.2017.

It is to be noticed that in **Sukhbir Singhs'** case the result of the written examination was declared in April 2017.

That being the case, the matter is squarely covered by the ratio of that judgment.

Consequently, finding no merit in this petition, it is dismissed in limine, but with no order as to costs.

September 11, 2017
vcgarg

(Amol Rattan Singh)
Judge

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes
Whether reportable:	Yes