

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

**CWP No. 5678 of 2018
Date of decision: 15.3.2018**

Babita Rani

... Petitioner

Versus

Haryana Staff Selection Commission

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI

Present: Mr. Sandeep Parkash Chahar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

ARUN PALLI, J. (Oral)

Notice of motion.

Mr. Hitesh Pandit, Additional A.G., Haryana, present in court,
accepts notice on behalf of the respondent. Copy supplied.

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

The petitioner competed for selection to the post of
Multi-Purpose Health Worker (female), in response to the advertisement
dated 19.6.2015 (Annexure P-1), in the DESM (General) Category. In terms
of the advertisement, she was required to append a certificate issued by the
Zila Sainik Board, in support of her candidature. Concededly, no such
certificate was submitted, whereas, a dependent certificate, dated 2.7.2012
(Annexure P-2), issued by Army, was annexed with the application form.
The petitioner participated in the written examination, and was even called
for scrutiny of documents on 23.5.2017. It was, at this stage, it was detected

CWP No. 5678 of 2018

that the petitioner had failed to submit the requisite certificate. In fact, the petitioner did not possess one even during scrutiny. Though, she alleged to have moved an application, vide diary No. 7483, on 23.5.2017 itself to the Commission, undertaking to furnish the required certificate at the earliest. And after she obtained the requisite certificate from the Zila Sainik Board on 30.5.2017 (Annexure P-6), the same was submitted to the Commission on 12.6.2017. But, still in the list of the short-listed candidates, who were called for interview, in the category of the petitioner, her name and roll number was not depicted. Obviously, for the required certificate was neither appended with the application form, nor produced during scrutiny. Thus, all what is urged by the learned counsel for the petitioner is; that let the respondent consider this petition as a representation on behalf of the petitioner and pass appropriate orders.

Learned State counsel submits that respondent shall look into the claim/grievance of the petitioner, if possible, even sympathetically, and pass appropriate orders, in accordance with law, within a period of two weeks from today.

The petition is accordingly disposed of, in the above terms. In the event, the claim of the petitioner is declined, the authority shall pass a comprehensive order, assigning reasons in support thereof.

15.3.2018
Ak Sharma

(Arun Palli)
Judge

Whether speaking / reasoned:	YES
Whether Reportable:	NO