

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

C.W.P. No.13635 of 2018

Date of Decision:-28.05.2018

Suresh Kumar

....Petitioner

vs.

State of Haryana and another

....Respondents

BEFORE :- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR MITTAL

Present:- Mr. Gurmohan Singh Bedi, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Sudhir Mittal, J. (Oral)

The petitioner is an applicant for the post of Engineering Drawing Instructor in the PHC & BC category pursuant to recruitment notice dated 25.4.2016 (Annexure P-1). The said advertisement pertained to appointment by direct recruitment. It was challenged by certain persons and appointments pursuant thereto were stayed by this Court. The interim order was ultimately vacated on 10.10.2017 and the writ petition itself was decided vide judgment dated 17.1.2018. It was held that regular appointments be made as expeditiously as possible.

The grievance of the petitioner is that although the stay was vacated vide order dated 10.10.2017, the petitioner is not being appointed despite the fact that he cleared the selection process being a candidate from PHC & BC category. A representation in this regard has been made by the petitioner but the same has been rejected vide order dated 3.5.2018 (Annexure P-13) on the ground that contractual appointments are not being made as the High Court has directed filling up of vacancies on regular basis.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that other persons have been appointed on contractual basis but the petitioner is being treated differently. Moreover, 64 posts have been advertised and only 31 persons have been appointed

up the said posts is arbitrary.

I have carefully considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. He has not been able to point out a single instance where an applicant has been given appointment after the vacation of stay vide order dated 10.10.2017. The respondents are entitled to fill up the posts on regular basis and petitioner cannot make any grievance against that.

Thus, there is no illegality in the impugned action. The writ petition is accordingly dismissed.

May 28, 2018

poonam

(SUDHIR MITTAL)

JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned

Yes

Whether Reportable

No