

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

115

CWP-12032-2018

Date of Decision: May 14, 2018

Vikas Jakhar

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SUDHIR MITTAL

Present: Mr. Ravinder Singh Dhull, Advocate for the petitioner.

Sudhir Mittal, J. (Oral)

The petitioner was an applicant pursuant to advertisement No.8, dated 20.02.2014. The advertisement was in respect of Haryana Civil Service (Executive Branch) and allied services. He qualified the examination held and was appointed in the Excise and Taxation Department. The result was announced on 02.09.2016, thereafter, the petitioner joined as Assistant Excise and Taxation Officer.

2. The grievance raised in the present writ petition is that certain answers were not marked properly. Information was sought under the Right to Information Act, 2005, which was supplied to him in February 2018. The petitioner was entitled to award of two and half marks and in case the said marks had been awarded to him, he would come within the cut off marks prescribed for the Haryana Civil Services (Executive Branch). Thus, he seeks quashing of the entire result and allocation of Haryana Civil Services (Executive Branch).

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner does not dispute that the petitioner

joined his service soon after the result was declared on 02.09.2016.

4. More than, a year and half has elapsed, since then. All the candidates would have joined their respective service. In case, the final result is un-settled at this stage, it would result in confusion. In fact the entire exercise would have to be re-done and the petitioner will not get any benefit from the correction of his answer-sheet. The petitioner has secured employment. The other selected candidates have not been made party in this writ petition.

5. In view of the above, I do find any ground to interfere at the behest of the petitioner, more so because he himself is not interested in getting the entire result set aside and getting fresh selection conducted

6. The writ petition is accordingly, dismissed.

May 14, 2018
sonia arora

[SUDHIR MITTAL]
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes
Whether Reportable :	No