

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

**CWP No.427 of 2018
Date of Decision : 16.01.2018.**

Sheela Devi

.....Petitioner

Versus

The State of Haryana and others

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE ARUN PALLI

Present : Mr. Rishi Pal Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Gaurav Jindal, Addl. A.G. Haryana.

Mr. Kanwal Goyal, Advocate for respondent No.3.

ARUN PALLI, J. (Oral)

The limited grievance of the petitioner is that she competed for selection to the post of Assistant Professor (College Cadre) HES-II in Political Science in the Scheduled Caste Category, but her candidature was wrongly being considered as a general category candidate. For, the representation made by her in this regard yielded no response, she approached this Court vide CWP No.23923 of 2017 (Sheela Devi Vs. State of Haryana and others) which was disposed of by this Court vide order dated 24.10.2017 requiring respondent No.3 to take a decision on her representation and pass a speaking order within a month from the receipt of certified copy of the said order. But as the respondents failed to comply with the order dated 24.10.2017, the petitioner even filed a contempt petition i.e. COCP No.3841 of 2017 which is pending for 15.02.2018. However, what necessitated to institute the petition at hands is that the respondents in the meanwhile had circulated the schedule for interview

which is slated to take place w.e.f. 18.01.2018 to 20.01.2018. Notice of this petition was issued and counsel for the respondents had caused appearance and granted time to ascertain the true position.

Mr. Kanwal Goyal, Advocate and Ms. Khyati Goyal, Advocate appearing for respondent No.3 have produced a copy of the order dated 29.11.2017, which reveals that in compliance to the order of this Court dated 24.10.2017, respondent No.3 had indeed passed an order on the representation of the petitioner. And, since on consideration of her candidature and claim even in the Scheduled Caste Category, the marks secured by her did not match the cut-off marks in the merit list of Scheduled Caste candidates, she could not qualify for interview in the said category.

In response, all what the counsel for the petitioner submits is that the copy of the order dated 29.11.2017 was never communicated to the petitioner. However, this fact is seriously disputed by the learned counsel for respondent No.3.

Be that as it may. Learned counsel for the respondent has since been furnished a copy of the order dated 29.11.2017 in the Court during the course of hearing. In the wake of the above, nothing substantive survives in this petition and the same is accordingly disposed of in the above terms.

16.01.2018

Manoj Bhutani

(ARUN PALLI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No