

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT

CHANDIGARH

CWP-1324-2018

Date of Decision: January 22, 2018

Kuldeep Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI

Present: Mr. Jasdev S. Thind, Advocate, for the petitioner.

ARUN PALLI, J. (ORAL)

Notice of motion.

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

In the nature of the order I propose to pass, no written statement/counter-affidavit of the respondent is indeed necessary, at this stage. Thus, with the consent of the parties, the petition is being disposed of finally.

Pursuant to the advertisement, dated 24.11.2015 (Annexure P-1), issued by the respondent, the petitioner competed for selection to the post of Clerk under BC (A) category, for, he was fully eligible therefor. The answer key/sequence chart issued by the respondent

showed that he had secured 140 marks and even the cut-off marks in the said category were 140. Although the successful candidates were called for interview from 13.10.2017 to 29.10.2017, but surprisingly the petitioner was ignored. He purports to have represented to the Secretary of the Haryana Staff Selection Commission, Panchkula, vide representation dated 11.10.2017 (Annexure P-6), but to no avail. Subsequently, pursuant to the revision in the answer key/sequence chart on December 2017, the marks secured by the petitioner were revised to 142. But he was still not called for interview. Again, he purports to have made a representation, dated 11.12.2017 (Annexure P-8), but that too yielded no result. In the meanwhile the respondent vide publication dated 10.01.2018 (Annexure P-9), have provided another opportunity to the candidates, who remained absent for scrutiny of documents-cum-interview from 13.10.2017 to 16.10.2017 on 23.01.2018 and the candidates who remained absent from 17.10.2017 to 29.10.2017 on 24.01.2018. Thus, it is contended that in the event the petitioner is not provisionally interviewed on the date fixed in this regard, he shall suffer an incalculable loss.

In response, learned State counsel submits that the claim of the petitioner as also his representation, dated 11.12.2017 (Annexure P-8), shall be considered and dealt with today itself and the appropriate orders in accordance with law shall be passed and communicated to the petitioner well in time.

That being so, the petition is disposed of in the above

terms. Needless to assert that in the event the claim of the petitioner is declined, the authorities shall pass a comprehensive order assigning reasons thereof. On the contrary, if he is found eligible/suitable and rather ought to have been called for interview, the necessary communication shall be issued without any further loss of time.

A copy of this order be supplied to the learned counsel for the parties under the signatures of the Bench Secretary.

(ARUN PALLI)
JUDGE

January 22, 2018

P Kapoor

Whether Speaking/Reasoned:
Whether Reportable:

YES / NO
YES / NO