

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH.**

**CWP No.27227 of 2017**

**Date of Decision:-30.04.2018**

**Gurpreet Singh.**

.....Petitioner.

Versus

**State of Punjab & Ors.**

.....Respondents.

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASWANT SINGH**

Present:- Mr. Sandeep Bansal, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Mrs. Lavanya Paul, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab  
assisted by Mr. Didar Singh, Senior Assistant and  
Mr. Mohit, Senior Assistant, Subordinate Services Selection  
Board, Punjab.

\*\*\*

**JASWANT SINGH, J.(ORAL)**

Petitioner has competed for appointment as Agriculture Sub Inspector (Soil) against the 134 posts advertised in the general category pursuant to the advertisement dated 29.12.2015 Annexure P-1. Petitioner on the basis of 62.69% of marks secured has been placed at No.149 of the joint merit list, as issued on 20.12.2016 (P-3).

The grievance of the petitioner is that only 95 candidates belonging to the general category had joined pursuant to the offer of appointment, and thereby the petitioner who falls within the zone of appointment against the unfilled vacancies have not been issued appointment letter.

Balwinder Singh Sidhu, Chief Conservator of Soils, Punjab stands filed. In the reply it is conceded that the offer of appointment letters to 28 candidates including 26 belong to general category who had not joined pursuant to the offer of appointment have since been cancelled on 8.9.2017. It is explained that offer of appointment have not been made against unfilled vacancies to the next in merit candidates falling within the zone of appointment against the advertised number of vacancies in each category due to non receipt of fresh recommendations/waiting list from the Subordinate Services Selection Board, Punjab.

However, at the time of hearing Mrs. Lavanya Paul, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab on instructions from Mr. Mohit, Senior Assistant from the office of Subordinate Services Selection Board, Punjab states that fresh recommendations would be made within four weeks from today by the Board and thereafter the department would issue appointment letters in accordance with law. Learned State Counsel on instructions further states that the Petitioner would fall within the zone of appointment.

In view of the agreed stand, nothing more survives for adjudication in the present writ petition which is hereby dismissed as infructuous.

( JASWANT SINGH )  
JUDGE

April 30, 2018  
Vinay

|                                  |               |
|----------------------------------|---------------|
| <i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i> | <i>Yes/No</i> |
| <i>Whether Reportable</i>        | <i>Yes/No</i> |