

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 27092 of 2017
Date of decision: 12.12.2017

MayankPetitioner(s)

Versus

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

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

Present: Mr. Gopal Soni, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Shruti Jain Goyal, AAG, Haryana.

G.S.SANDHAWALIA, J. (Oral)

Notice of motion was issued on 28.11.2017 by noting the
following contention:-

“Counsel for the petitioner inter alia contends that the petitioner was an applicant against the post of Industrial Extension Officer under BC-A category for which there was one post. He sat in the written examination and as per the result declared on 30.09.2017 (Annexure P-4), he was called for scrutiny of documents. However, vide notice dated 21.11.2017 (Annexure P-5) two persons have been called for interview for the said post and the cut off marks were fixed at 160. The interview was fixed on 27.11.2017 and the petitioner was not called. It is the case of the petitioner that as per his calculation, he got more than 160 marks.

Notice of motion.

Ms. Shruti Goyal, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the respondents. A copy of the paper-book be supplied to her during the course of the day.

The result of the petitioner be produced on the next date of hearing.

Adjourned to 01.12.2017.”

In the written statement filed today, it is submitted that the petitioner has secured 150 marks and not 160 marks and, therefore, the argument raised as such does not survive as the petitioner does not fall within the zone of consideration.

Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed.

12.12.2017
shivani

(G.S. SANDHAWALIA)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No