

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.8252 of 2018

Date of Decision: 04.04.2018

Pinki

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

... Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV NARAIN RAINA

Present: Mr. U.K. Agnihotri, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

RAJIV NARAIN RAINA, J.(Oral)

1. When the matter came up this morning, I asked Ms. Shruti Jain Goyal, AAG, Haryana to take instructions from the Haryana Staff Selection Commission regarding an argument based on the contents of para.11 of the petition averring that 7 candidates bearing roll numbers mentioned in para.11 were not called for interview as these roll numbers are not mentioned in the List Annex P-4 which starts at running p.36 of the paper-book (to be read as Annex P-4 and not Annex P-3 as wrongly numbered). Annex P-3 is the Admit Card for interview of the petitioner.

2. When the matter was taken up in the post lunch session the learned Law Officer armed with instructions points out from Annex P-4 itself at p.38 of the paper-book that the 7 roll numbers mentioned in para.11 find mention in the list of Notice to candidates to appear for the interview in the BC-A category to which category the petitioner belongs. These have been tick marked at p.38 of the paper-book by Ms. Goyal and the same have been cross-checked with the roll numbers in para.11 and they match

perfectly. Not only are the names of the candidates mentioned roll number wise in para.11 of the petition their names also find mention in the Result of Written Examination for the post of Multi Purpose Health Worker (Female) against advertisement No.01/2015, category No.09.

3. In the final result the names of the roll numbers mentioned in para.11 figure in the select list and those have been highlighted in blue by the learned Law Officer. The result of the written examination produced in Court is taken on record as Mark 'A' and 'B'.

4. The result of the petitioner has also been brought to Court. The petitioner has secured 111 marks against cut off 114 marks while the cut off marks in the waiting list is 112. The original register has been produced and perused. The name of the petitioner Pinki falls at Sr. No.391 with roll No.22109404. In the written examination she has secured 100 out of 160 marks. She has been given Zero for experience and 11 for viva voce, making a total of 111 out of 200.

5. It is apparent that a false statement has been made in para.11 of the petition which is contrary to record placed even on the file, as explained above while referring to p.38 of the paper-book. The argument advanced by the petitioner that some candidates who have not been called for interview have been selected is a false statement. This is a false and frivolous petition filed without thought paid and which has consumed considerable time of the Court in two sessions on a single day of hearing.

6. The petition is, therefore, dismissed with costs of ₹25,000/- to be paid to the Old Age Home, Sector-15, Chandigarh within one month from today and receipt produced in the Registry of this Court.. In case the

sum is not paid the Old Age Home, Sector 15, Chandigarh would have a right to recover the money as arrears of land revenue.

7. Copy of this order be sent to the Old Age Home, Sector-15, Chandigarh for necessary action.

(RAJIV NARAIN RAINA)
JUDGE

04.04.2018
manju

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether reportable	No