

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

CWP No.24460 of 2017

Date of Decision: October 27, 2017

Vaibhav and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present:- Mr. Karan Bhullar, Advocate, for the petitioners.

Amol Rattan Singh, J. (Oral)

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that against 31 posts of Clerks advertised in the Outstanding Sports Persons (BC-B category) vide the advertisement (Annexure P-1), read with its corrigendum dated 01.01.2016 (also part of Annexure P-1), 72 persons have been called for scrutiny of documents-cum-interview by the respondent-Commission, which is 10 persons more than double the number of persons to be interviewed as are the number of posts advertised.

The reason for calling 10 persons extra seems to be that since scrutiny of documents is to be done at the time of interviews itself, if any person is found not eligible, then as per the expectation of the Commission, at least double the number of candidates as the number of posts advertised, would still be available for final interview in the selection process.

However, the contention of the learned counsel is to the effect that much more than 10 candidates are actually ineligible, they not having the required eligibility certificate issued by the Deputy Director, Department

of Sports and Youth Affairs, Government of Haryana, (as contended).

Considering the nature of the controversy, notice is not felt necessary to be issued in this petition, which is disposed of with a direction to the respondent-Commission that in case the number of candidates as appeared for scrutiny-cum-interview falls short of double the number of posts that are to be filled up, i.e. if the number of candidates called for scrutiny-cum-interview, falls short of 62, the Commission would then invite for interviews as many number of candidates as have fallen short of double the number of posts advertised, so as to ensure that at least twice the number of candidates are called for interviews as are the posts advertised, in terms of the notification of the Government by which twice the number of candidates are mandatorily required to be called.

It is made clear that this Court, naturally, is not making any comment on whether or not particular candidates are eligible or not in terms of the criteria adopted by the Commission, which would be seen by the Commission at the time of scrutiny of documents of each candidate.

October 27, 2017
vcgarg

(**Amol Rattan Singh**)
Judge

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes
Whether reportable:	No