

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT

CHANDIGARH

CWP-1264-2018

Date of Decision: January 22, 2018

Krishan Kumar and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI

Present: Mr. Jagjit Gill, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

ARUN PALLI, J. (ORAL)

Notice of motion.

Mr. Siddharth Sanwaria, DAG, Haryana, present in Court,
accepts notice on behalf of the respondents. Copies furnished.

In the nature of the order I propose to pass in the matter, no
written statements/counter-affidavits of the respondents are indeed
necessary, at this stage. Thus, with the consent of the parties, the
petition is being disposed of finally.

Pursuant to the advertisement issued by respondent No. 3-
State Project Director, Haryana School Shiksha Pariyojna Parishad,
Panchkula, the petitioners competed for selection to the post of Post

Graduate Teacher (PGT) in Computer Science. They purported to have

qualified the written examination conducted on 16.09.2012. Vide publication, dated 04.10.2013 (Annexure P-2), the petitioners alongwith other short-listed candidates were called for interview on 9th, 10th & 11th October, 2013. The petitioners alleged to have participated in the interview, but they are still awaiting the final results, particularly when the final results in every other category were declared. The petitioners claim to have represented to the respondents in this regard repeatedly, but to no avail. Rather, in response to the information asked by one of the candidates in the same category, under the Right to Information Act, 2005, vide letter dated 20.09.2016 (Annexure P-3), he was conveyed that the records as regards selection to the post of PGT-Computer Science have since been sent to the higher authorities for final decision. Likewise, vide letter dated 16.11.2017 (Annexure P-4), conveyed to another candidate, it is maintained that the file is put up to the higher authorities and it was not mandatory to respond as to how much time it will take to finalize the result. The grievance of the petitioners is that years have rolled by but no result is in sight. The legal notice, respondent No. 3 has been served with, dated 28.11.2017 (Annexure P-5), too has failed to evoke any response. Thus, the petitioners continue to suffer.

In response, learned State counsel submits that the grievances of the petitioners as also the legal notice, dated 28.11.2017 (Annexure P-5), shall be considered and dealt with by the respondents,

within a period of six weeks from today. And, appropriate orders in

accordance with law shall be passed and communicated to the petitioners.

That being so, the petition is accordingly disposed of in the above terms.

(ARUN PALLI)
JUDGE

January 22, 2018

P Kapoor

Whether Speaking/Reasoned:
Whether Reportable:

YES / NO
YES / NO