

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH****Date of decision: 22.03.2018****CWP No.7088 of 2018**

Garima

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana & others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV NARAIN RAINAPresent: Ms. Mandeep Kaur, Advocate,
for the petitioner.**RAJIV NARAIN RAINA, J. (ORAL)**

By way of this petition, the petitioner challenges the selection of Post Graduate Teachers of English (Category No.12) made by the erstwhile Haryana School Teachers Selection Board, Haryana against Advertisement No.1/2012 dated 07.06.2012. Appointments were offered to the successful candidates in the year 2013 and the selection process has concluded. After an inordinate delay of about 5 years, the petitioner has approached this Court complaining that in the interview her marks were purposely depressed as against her written marks to keep her out of the zone of selection. According to the information received under Right to Information Act, 2005, the petitioner asserts that she secured 16 marks out of 33 in the interview. This is not a shocking revelation. This argument was one of the grounds of challenge in CWP No.11736 of 2013 titled 'Jagbir Singh Vs. State of Haryana & another' and 64 connected cases, decided on 15.02.2016 regarding the same selection, apart from the challenge laid to the validity of the criteria adopted for the selection. Since the matter has been

examined by this Court and similar petitions dismissed, this petition would suffer the same fate not only on merits, but also in addition on the ground of long delay and unexplained laches preventing petitioner from seeking legal redress in reasonable time. If a civil suit was brought today on the same cause of action, it would be barred by limitation. If the petitioner felt satisfied for about five years by remaining inert and to be seen as waiving her rights, if any, then the writ court exercising extraordinary, equitable and discretionary jurisdiction would not act in her aid or to interfere in the matter when delay, laches and limitation have clouded her remedy beyond sight. Interference is not called for at all also in view of the dicta in State of Madhya Pradesh Vs. Bhailal Bhai, AIR 1964 SC 1006 [CB], their Lordships of the Supreme Court observed that the maximum period fixed by the legislature as the time within which the relief by a suit in a civil court must be brought may ordinarily be taken to be a reasonable standard by which delay in seeking remedy under Article 226 can be measured. It would then be prudent for the High Court to refuse entertainment of a writ petition. Then the principles of *laches* become the latches or padlocks on the storehouse of relief claimable from the writ court.

Consequently, and as a result of the discussion above, the present petition is devoid of merit and is dismissed for more reasons than one.

22.03.2018
Vimal

[RAJIV NARAIN RAINA]
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned:</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Whether Reportable:</i>	<i>Yes</i>