

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

CWP No. 21807 of 2017
Date of decision: 25.09.2017

AnitaPetitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others ...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE G.S.SANDHAWALIA

Present: Mr. Sanchit Punia, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

G.S.SANDHAWALIA, J. (Oral)

The petitioner seeks declaration of the result for the post of PGT, Home Science against advertisement no. 4 of 2015 under category no. 9. It is his case that she had applied for the said post but was not successful in the HTET Level 3 examination having got 89 marks (Annexure P-1) and, therefore, did not have the basic essential qualifications. She filed CWP No. 17153 of 2016 in which she was petitioner no. 2 and an interim order was passed on 30.01.2017 (Annexure P-3) that she would be provisionally scrutinized subject to the final outcome of the writ petition for the purposes of appearing in the interview. Resultantly, the result was declared on 03.03.2017 (Annexure P-4) wherein, roll no. 40900282 was mentioned under Note 2, which was to be subject to the outcome of the writ petition No. 17153 of 2016 alongwith other cases. The writ petition of the petitioner was disposed of alongwith the main case bearing CWP No. 15979 of 2016, Sarita Yadav vs. Board of School Education, Haryana and others

(Annexure P-5) after credit was given of 5 questions for the HTET Level 3 (PGT examination) held in February, 2016. Resultantly, the petitioner qualified and the requisite certificate was issued by the Board of School Education on 02.08.2017 (Annexure P-6). The petitioner accordingly submitted a representation dated 21.08.2017 (Annexure P-7) to the respondent-Commission for declaration of her result which had been withheld. It is her grouse now that the appointment letters have been issued on 31.08.2017 (Annexure P-8) but the petitioner has not been given the benefit. Accordingly, similar consideration is also sought.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Harish Rathee, Sr. DAG, Haryana accepts notice. Copy of the writ petition has been supplied to him.

Keeping in view the above, this Court is of the opinion that no useful purpose would be served to ask the respondents to file reply in view of the above facts since the decision making is still to be completed.

Accordingly, without commenting on the merits of the case or the entitlement of the petitioner for the abovesaid relief and keeping in view the fact that the matter is still pending consideration, the present writ petition is disposed of with direction to respondent-Commission to take a decision on the representation dated 21.08.2017 (Annexure P-7) and declare the result of the petitioner. In case the petitioner is found successful and falls within the zone of consideration for appointment, necessary steps will be taken to send a recommendation to the State Government for appointment. The said exercise shall be done within a period of 4 weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of the order. In case the petitioner

does not fall within the zone of consideration, the Commission will inform the petitioner.

25.09.2017
shivani

(G.S. SANDHAWALIA)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No