

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH****Date of decision: 10.07.2019****CWP No.11176 of 1999**

Naresh Kumar

...Petitioner

Vs.

District & Sessions Judge, Sirsa & others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV NARAIN RAINA

Present: None for the petitioner.

Mr. Saurabh Mohunta, DAG, Haryana, for respondent No.1.

RAJIV NARAIN RAINA, J. (ORAL)

1. No one puts in appearance on behalf of the petitioner, nor is a pass over sought. In the circumstances, the case is taken up for disposal. I have carefully gone through the case file and heard Mr. Saurabh Mohunta, DAG, Haryana.

2. This petition calls in question recruitment of Additional Ahlmads in Sessions Division, Sirsa. The petitioner was a contestant and appeared in the written examination; typing test and interview. The result was declared in September, 1997. He was not selected. He made a representation to the authorities to offer him appointment by setting aside the selection in the Scheduled Caste category to which the petitioner belongs.

3. The instant petition was filed seeking directions to respondent No.1 i.e. the District & Sessions Judge, Sirsa to provide the petitioner the result of the written examination in the category of Scheduled Castes, the criteria for making allotment of marks in the interview etc.

4. In the written statement filed on behalf of respondent, it has been disclosed that the petitioner failed to make it to the merit list. The record of the written examination, type test and interview, which had been maintained and kept in safe custody and that shows that the petitioner obtained 32 marks in written examination and in the type test/interview he obtained only 1 mark. He could type only four lines with six mistakes, though in all 13 lines were to be typed, which he could not attempt and thus he was graded 'C'. He demonstrated no knowledge of working on a computer. His IQ and personality was assessed as Average. The result of the interview is annexed as Annexure R-III. Thus, as far as prayers made in this petition are concerned, the petition is rendered infructuous as the prayers have been answered with disclosure of the material sought. On the merits of the selection his claim remains unsubstantiated that there was something amiss in the selection. In any case, the petitioner has no case for appointment and, that too, after two decades.

5. Accordingly, I find no merit in the instant petition and the same is hereby dismissed. Copy of this order be posted to the petitioner.

10.07.2019
Vimal

[RAJIV NARAIN RAINA]
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:
Whether Reportable:

Yes
Yes/No