

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

Amit Kumar
18.01.11 13:07
Attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

CWP No.408 of 2018

Date of decision: 11.01.2018

Vinay Kumar

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI

Present: Mr. Deepak Sonak, 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 respondents. Copies supplied.

In the nature of order, I propose to pass, no formal written
statement(s)/counter-affidavit(s) on behalf of the respondents are indeed
necessary at this stage. Thus, with the consent of the parties, the petition is
being finally disposed of.

Vide advertisement No.11/2015, dated 1.12.2015, Town &
Country Planning Department advertised 10 posts of Junior Draftsman. The
petitioner participated in the written examination and purports to have
cleared the same by securing 114 marks. And thereafter, the candidates,
who had cleared the written examination including the petitioner, were
called for scrutiny of documents. However, in the list circulated by the
respondents, dated 29.12.2017 (Annexure P-5), all the short listed
candidates have been called for interview, but the roll number of the

petitioner was/is not reflected therein. Even though the cut-off marks in the written examination in general category was 110, whereas, the petitioner had obtained 114 marks. The petitioner even purports to have represented to the respondents, vide representation dated 2.1.2018 (Annexure P-6), but the same too has failed to evoke any response. The interview in the concerned category is slated to take place on 12.1.2018.

In response, learned counsel for the respondents submits that the grievance/representation of the petitioner, dated 2.1.2018 (Annexure P-6) shall be considered and decided by the respondents. And appropriate orders in accordance with law shall be passed and communicated to the petitioner by today itself.

That being so, the petition is accordingly disposed of in the above terms. Needless to assert that in the event, the claim of the petitioner is accepted and he ought to have been called for the purpose of interview, the necessary orders in this regard shall be passed

(Arun Palli)
Judge

11.01.2018
AK Sharma

Whether speaking / reasoned: YES

Whether Reportable: NO