

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

CWP-309-2017

Date of decision: 12.01.2017

Sumeet Amba

...Petitioner

Versus

Punjab State Transmission Corporation Limited & others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present: Mr. B.S. Guliani, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

JAISHREE THAKUR, J. (ORAL)

The instant writ petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India seeking a writ in the nature of mandamus directing respondents No.1 & 2 i.e. 1. Punjab State Transmission Corporation Limited, Shakti Sadan, Opposite Kali Mata Mandir, Patiala through Chairman-cum-Managing Director; and 2. Chief Engineer, Punjab State Transmission Corporation Limited, Opposite Kali Mata Mandir, Shakti Sadan, Patiala, to appoint the petitioner as Sub Station Attendant on account of having a higher merit as per Annexure P-1. A challenge has also been made to the revised list that was prepared in the year 2012.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner herein applied to be appointed on the post of Sub Station Attendant pursuant to an advertisement that was issued. A combined merit list was prepared on the basis of examination that was held and in the said list name of the petitioner was reflected at Sr. No. 151. Subsequent thereto on

24.11.2012, another merit list came to be prepared for the same written examination that was held on 13.10.2012 and in the said list, name of the petitioner was reflected at Sr. No. 147. The petitioner thereafter was called for documents verification but, however, no appointment was offered to him whereas persons who had obtained lesser marks than him in the initial merit list have been offered appointment. The grievance of the petitioner is that despite having been called for documents verification no letter of appointment has been offered to him.

From a perusal of the writ petition it appears that the petitioner has approached this Court directly without first approaching the department concerned either to challenge the revised merit list or to seek an explanation as to why his candidature has not been considered.

Faced with this, Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he may be allowed to withdraw the instant writ petition with a liberty to approach the department concerned who should treat this petition as a representation itself.

Without going into the merits or forming any opinion thereon this writ petition is disposed of by giving a liberty to the petitioner to serve a copy of the writ petition upon the respondents, who are directed to treat the same as his representation. The departments concerned are hereby directed to look into the grievance of the petitioner and decide the case of the petitioner by passing a speaking order expeditiously, preferably within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order along with the copy of the writ petition.

Writ petition stands disposed of accordingly with the aforesaid direction.

12.01.2017

Satyawan

(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes.
No.