

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

115

CWP No.2734 of 2017

Date of Decision : 14.02.2017

Gaurav

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present : Mr. R.K. Saini, Advocate
for the petitioner.

AJAY TEWARI, J. (Oral)

By this petition the petitioner is challenging the action of the respondents in not considering his claim for the post of Junior Engineer (Mechanical) PWD (B&R).

Brief facts of the case are that the respondent No.2 advertized the posts of Junior Engineer in various category by advertisement Annexure P-1. The petitioner appeared in a written test and by advertisement Annexure P-2 the result was declared and the petitioner was successful. At the end of that advertisement whereby the result was declared the following note was given:-

be held on 02.02.2017 and 03.02.2017 as per schedule to be notified shortly on Commission's website i.e. www.hssc.gov.in. The candidate are advised to report in the Commission Office, Bays No.67-70, Sector 2, Panchkula. They are also directed to bring all original documents, set of attested copies of all documents and self attested copy of downloaded application form.

2. It is important to note that after the scrutiny of documents if a candidate is found eligible it will not confer any right of interview and candidates only falling within twice the number of vacancies above shall be called for interview.....”

It is the contention of the learned counsel that unfortunately the mother of the petitioner met with an accident on 16.01.2017 and had undergone major surgery on 20.01.2017. Further she was advised for follow-up treatment on various dates i.e. 28.01.2017, 31.01.2017 and 07.02.2017 and consequently the petitioner neither read the newspaper nor accessed the website and resultantly he did not come to know that he had cleared the test and that he had to report in the Commission alongwith original documents on 02/03.02.2017.

On an identical issue I had dismissed a writ petition bearing CWP No.1379 of 2017 titled as ***Rekha Jangra vs. The State of Haryana and others*** on 30.01.2017 and I put it to the learned counsel that this case

would have to be dismissed in the same terms. He however states that in

this case there is further issue which has been raised and that issue is with regard to the reasonableness of the condition prescribing schedule for bringing original documents. As per him the purpose of submission of hard copy is only to verify the credentials of the candidate and it can well be done on the date of the interview. In my opinion, this argument would also have to be taken to be covered by the arguments raised in Rekha Jangra's case (supra) and consequently I find no reason to take a different view.

Consequently, the petition stands dismissed in the same terms as the case of Rekha Jangra (supra).

Since the main case has been decided, the pending civil miscellaneous application, if any, also stands disposed of.

February 14, 2017
ashish

(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned - Yes/No

Whether reportable - Yes/No