

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

**CWP No.18997 of 2019
Date of decision:16.07.2019**

Vishnu Dutt Sharma

... Petitioner

Vs.

Haryana Staff Selection Commission, Panchkula and another
... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present:- Mr. Mani Ram Verma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

AMIT RAWAL J.

Petitioner has sought indulgence of this Court under Article 226 of Constitution of India for directing the respondents to scrutinize the documents & to interview for the post of PGT History (Rest of Haryana) Secondary Education Department, Haryana.

Mr. Mani Ram Verma, learned counsel appearing on behalf of petitioner submitted that Haryana Staff Selection Commission, Panchkula caused advertisement no.4 of 2015 inviting applications for filling up 398 posts of PGT History. The petitioner being eligible applied for the said post in General Category and was allotted roll number 13080391. The written examination was held on 13.03.2016. On the basis of result, candidates were called for scrutiny of the documents but petitioner was not aware of date fixed for scrutiny from 16.01.2017 to 18.01.2017. The candidates whose documents were scrutinized were called for interview whereas petitioner

was not. The petitioner also acquired the knowledge that he was called for scrutiny of documents on 26.11.2018 and candidates who were not present for scrutiny of documents, were also present but petitioner did not have knowledge of same and acquired knowledge of notice, Annexure P-4. Haryana Staff Selection Commission in pursuance to the directions of this Court called the candidates for interview for the post of PGT History on 26.12.2018 but this fact was not in the knowledge of petitioner. Process of interview was initiated on 25.03.2019 which is evident from notice dated 25.03.2019, Annexure P-4 and thereafter, on 22.06.2019 as per the notice dated 16.06.2019 shown to this Court during the course of hearing and therefore, appropriate direction may be issued as petitioner has right of consideration and would know the fate of his performance in the interview.

I am afraid the aforementioned contention cannot be accepted for the simple reason that three opportunities have been granted by Haryana Staff Selection Commission but petitioner feigned ignorance. No plausible and reasonable explanation has been given in not availing the opportunity. The selection process is already over now. The entire process cannot be put on hold or put the clock back permitting the petitioner for interview. Had there been a reasonable explanation in not availing the opportunity, perhaps this Court would have come to rescue but the writ petition is bereft of any averment. No ground is made out for issuance of directions to the respondents.

Dismissed.

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

July 16, 2019
savita

Whether Speaking/Reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No