

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

**CWP No.9030 of 2017
Date of decision: 06.08.2018**

Ganashwar Verma

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM:HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RITU BAHRI

Present: Mr. Jasbir Mor, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

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

Ritu Bahri, J.

This petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India is for issuance of direction to respondent-commission to call the petitioner for scrutiny of documents and let him participate in the interview for the post of TGT English, which was advertised vide advertisement No.9/2015 dated 23.07.2015 (Annexure P-2).

Upon notice, short reply dated 03.09.2017 has been filed on behalf of Haryana Staff Selection Commission-respondent No.2, wherein it has been stated that the candidates who had got interim orders in their favour by approaching this Court, had been granted separate dates for scrutiny of documents. Finally, in compliance with the order dated 15.11.2016 passed by this Court in CWP No.19189 of 2016, titled as 'Monika vs. State of Haryana and others', persons having roll numbers mentioned in Annexure P-6 were called for scrutiny of documents on 07.12.2016. Further, in notice dated 01.12.2016, it was made clear that after

the scrutiny of documents, if a candidate is found eligible, it will not confer any right of interview and candidates only falling within twice the number of vacancies above, shall be called for interview. In view of the said notice, petitioner never appeared for scrutiny of documents. Scrutiny sheet of the petitioner has been annexed as Annexure R-3/1. Thereafter, vide notice dated 14.01.2017, the Commission decided to call all the candidates for scrutiny of documents on 23.01.2017 in compliance with the order dated 15.11.2016 passed by this Court in CWP No.19189 of 2016. It has been further stated that one last notice was given on 03.08.2017 (Annexure R-3/2) informing that all the candidates, who have interim orders in their favour, shall be given opportunity for scrutiny of documents/interview. All the absentees, who could not appear for scrutiny of documents would also be given a chance to appear for scrutiny of documents.

Precise case of the respondents is that as per final general notice (Annexure R-3/2), the petitioner could have come up for scrutiny of the documents. Learned State counsel states that after this notice, no further notice was given.

After hearing learned counsel for the parties, this petition is disposed of by giving a direction that if, the petitioner had participated in the scrutiny of documents pursuant to notice dated 03.08.2017 (Annexure R-3/2), his case will be considered in accordance with law.

06.08.2018
ajp

(RITU BAHRI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No