

212+109

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

**CM No.13951-CII of 2019 in/and
COCP No.3808 of 2017
Date of Decision: 19.09.2019**

Paramjit Singh

Petitioner

Versus

Anurag Aggarwal, IAS, Home Secretary, U.T., Chandigarh and
another

Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. Rahul Sharma-I, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Pankaj Jain, Sr. Standing Counsel, Chandigarh with
Mr. Arvind Rajotia, Addl. Government Pleader
for the respondents.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (Oral):

The petitioner filed a writ petition being aggrieved of dismissal of Original Application by the Central Administrative Tribunal, Chandigarh. The challenge of the petitioner was to the appointment of respondent No.4. (in the writ petition) in pursuance to the advertisement dated 07.03.2007. The writ petition was allowed, the appointment of respondent No.4 was set aside and U.T. Administration was directed to proceed with the selection process as per requirement of advertisement and law. The petitioner was held entitled to cost of ₹10,000/-. The judgment was challenged by filing SLP, the same was dismissed on 10.04.2017.

The grievance of the petitioner is that in spite of succeeding in the writ petition, the petitioner was not appointed rather some Shambhu Nath was appointed though he was not eligible.

The stand of the respondent is that there is a policy of year 2014 as per which the said post is not being filled up by the permanent employee and is being filled up through outsource. It is submitted that Shambhu Nath was the only one in the waiting list and was given appointment as per the advertisement. Shambhu Nath refused to join and respondents are not making any further selection.

Learned counsel for the petitioner, at this stage, submits that Shambhu Nath was wrongly appointed as he was not eligible and seeks liberty to challenge the selection of Shambhu Nath.

The contempt petition is disposed of with liberty as prayed for.

Rule issued against the respondents stands discharged.

Since the main case is disposed of, the application for placing on record additional documents has been rendered infructuous.

**[AVNEESH JHINGAN]
JUDGE**

September 19, 2019

pankaj baweja

1. Whether speaking/ reasoned	:	Yes / No
2. Whether reportable	:	Yes / No