

IN THE PUNJAB & HARYANA HIGH COURT AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-28077-2017

Date of decision : 11.12.2017

Davinder Singh and others

... Petitioners

Versus

Haryana Public Service Commission and another

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Mr.Devender Punia, Advocate
for the petitioners.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J.(ORAL)

By this petition, the petitioners seek to be called for an interview, or at least a scrutiny of documents, on the ground that pursuant to the advertisement Annexure P-1, in which the last date for submission of applications was given as 15.03.2016, 72 candidates have been called for scrutiny of documents / interview, i.e. thrice the number of posts 25 advertised for the subject of PGT History, as per the said advertisement itself.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the candidature of six candidates having been rejected on the ground that they were not found eligible upon scrutiny of documents, the petitioners have a right to be called for at least screening of documents, in order to fill in the gap caused on account of rejection of the candidature of the aforesaid 6 candidates.

Whereas the arguments may otherwise not have been without merit, but for the fact that the last date for submission of application forms

thrice the number of posts advertised, having been notified by the State Government on 11.08.2017.

In fact because that notification is of August 2017, a co-ordinate Bench has already taken a view, upheld by the Division Bench, that candidates only equal to twice the number of posts advertised should be called for an interview, as regards those posts that were advertised prior to 11.08.2017.

That being so, and 72 candidates against 25 posts already having been called for scrutiny of documents/interview, with 6 candidates' candidature rejected, the remaining candidates would be 66, i.e. more than twice the number of posts advertised.

Consequently, in view of the above, applying the ratio of the judgment in CWP no.18878 of 2017, upheld by the Division Bench in LPA no.1674 of 2017, there is no merit in the petition, which therefore is dismissed.

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

December 11, 2017.

Davinder Kumar

Whether speaking / reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No