

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

CWP No.12984 of 2017(O&M)
Date of decision: 15.02.2018

Anoop Singh Yadav

... Petitioner

Versus

Haryana Staff Selection Commission

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI

Present: Mr. Kuldeep Sheoran, Advocate for
Mr. Jasbir Mor, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. BR Mahajan, Advocate General, Haryana with
Mr. Gaurav Jindal, Addl. AG, Haryana.

ARUN PALLI, J. (Oral)

The petitioner prays for a direction to the respondent to provide him another chance to participate in the scrutiny of documents before the interview/viva voce, for he could not appear on the specified date i.e. 27.05.2017 in this regard, owing to certain unavoidable circumstances.

The petitioner competed for selection to the post of Multipurpose Health Worker (Male) pursuant to an advertisement No.1/2015, dated 19.06.2015. Concededly, he qualified the written examination. The results were pronounced on 06.05.2017, and the short-listed candidates were called for scrutiny of documents from 15.05.2017 to 17.05.2017. Out of the total candidates i.e. 3146, 2984 candidates appeared for scrutiny. But as 162 candidates did not appear, the respondents to safeguard the interest of the short-listed candidates provided them another chance. For, vide notice dated 24.05.2017 (Annexure P7), they were now

required to appear on 27.05.2017. The information was accordingly uploaded on the website of the Commission on 24.05.2017 itself. Additionally, the information was also circulated vide a newspaper i.e. Punjab Kesri. But as the said notice was published on the date of scrutiny itself i.e. 27.05.2017, and even though 23 candidates appeared, the respondents to avert any harm to the interest of the remaining candidates, vide notice dated 29.06.2017 (Annexure R-1), afforded yet another opportunity to the absentee candidates for 06.07.2017. As a result, 15 candidates, including the petitioner, appeared on the appointed date, and their documents were duly scrutinized. But, since while issuing notice of motion on 02.06.2017, this Court had stayed the entire process of selection, those candidates are yet to be interviewed by the Commission. As indicated earlier, the notice dated 29.06.2017 (Annexure R-1) was issued during the pendency of this petition, and pursuant thereto the petitioner had since appeared for scrutiny, nothing substantive survives in this petition. Accordingly, learned counsel for the parties are *ad idem* that the matter be disposed of as having been rendered infructuous.

Disposed of as infructuous.

The stay order dated 02.06.2017 is accordingly vacated.

15.02.2018
Rajan

(Arun Palli)
Judge

Whether speaking / reasoned:	YES
Whether Reportable:	NO