

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

CWP No.3377 of 2019
Date of decision : 19.03.2019

Ramesh Kumar

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RITU BAHRI

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

Ritu Bahri, J. (oral)

Petitioner is seeking setting aside of the order dated 13.12.2018 (Annexure P-15) along with selection/appointment of respondent Nos.3 and 4. He is further seeking direction to respondent Nos. 1 and 2 to appoint him on the post of Clerk-cum-Data Entry Operator, which was advertised vide advertisement dated 23.10.2008 (Annexure P-1).

Learned counsel for the petitioner has referred to the information received under the Right to Information Act, 2005, whereby Registrar (Establishment) of respondent No.2-University has informed the Public Information Officer that selection to the post of Clerk-cum-Data Entry Operator against advertisement No.24/2008 were made and appointment letters have been issued to the selected candidates on 22.03.2010.

Grievance of the petitioner is that no information with regard to the result has been given to him. Hence, he was not aware as to how much marks he had obtained. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that

result was never declared in any manner. Petitioner served a legal notice dated 15.10.2018 upon the respondent-University. In response to the said notice, respondent-University has clarified vide letter dated 13.12.2018 (Annexure P-15) that final result was informed to the selected candidates individually through registered posts and name of Sh. Ramesh Kumar was placed in the waiting list under BC-A category. It is further informed that two candidates namely Sh. Ram Niwas and Sh. Deepak Verma were selected from BC-A category as they had secured higher marks than Ramesh Kumar-petitioner.

The impugned selection was made way back in the year 2010 and the petitioner has now tried to cover up the delay by getting information under the Right to Information Act in the year 2018. The present petition is liable to be dismissed on the ground of delay itself. Since, the petitioner had participated in the selection process, it is his duty to find out as to when the selected candidates had joined.

No merits.

Dismissed.

19.03.2019

ajp

(RITU BAHRI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No