

CWP No. 7510 of 2018

Amit Kumar
2018.03.26 17:11
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document
1

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

**CWP No. 7510 of 2018
Date of decision: 26.3.2018**

Geeta Devi

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI

Present: Mr. J.K. Goel, Advocate
for the petitioner.

ARUN PALLI, J. (Oral)

Notice of motion.

Mr. R.K. Doon, AAG., 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 learned counsel for the parties, the petition is being disposed of finally.

The petitioner competed for selection to the post of MPHWW (Female), in response to the advertisement dated 19.6.2015 (Annexure P-1),

CWP No. 7510 of 2018

in the Outstanding Sports Person (BCA) Category. She qualified the written examination, and was even called for scrutiny of documents. The limited grievance that she has is; that even though she appeared in the interview on the appointed date, i.e. 12.3.2018, but she was never interviewed, for she had not appended the gradation certificate, in support of her candidature. It is urged that the certificates furnished by the petitioner, during the course of scrutiny, were duly examined by the respondents, and once she was cleared for interview, there was no occasion to hold her ineligible for want of gradation certificate subsequently.

I am afraid: the argument lacks conviction and cannot be countenanced. Concededly, in terms of the advertisement (Annexure P-1), a candidate applying in the Outstanding Sports Person (OSP) Category was required to append the gradation certificate along with application form. And to present the same even at the time of scrutiny. But, the petitioner defaulted on both the occasions. Even though, post scrutiny, she was asked to appear for interview, but that would not enure to her benefit, as she did not possess the requisite certificate and was, thus, ineligible. Thus, it appears that it was owing to some error or omission, she was still permitted to participate in the interview. Not just that, no such certificate has either been applied or even appended with this petition. Concededly, the process of selection has since been concluded. Thus, the only and the inevitable conclusion one could reach is: the petition is devoid of merit, and is, thus, liable to be dismissed.

At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that as the appointments have not yet been made, the petitioner, after obtaining the requisite certificates, can still represent to the respondents for consideration of her claim.

If that be so, and the petitioner makes any such representation,
this Court is sanguine that the respondent authorities shall consider and deal
therewith, in accordance with law.

26.3.2018
AK Sharma

(ARUN PALLI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking / reasoned:	YES
Whether Reportable:	NO