

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP No.18114 of 2019

Date of Decision: July 08, 2019

Suresh Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

Haryana Staff Selection Commission & another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present: Mr. Karan Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

AMIT RAWAL, J. (Oral)

In the present writ petition, petitioner has sought writ of mandamus directing the respondents to scrutinize his documents and if found eligible, interview him for the post of Auction Recorder and complete all the subsequent stages of the selection process as the Commission, after a gap of about one year after the declaration of result of written examination on 13.04.2017, only uploaded the notification dated 15.04.2018 (Annexure P-5) on the website.

Mr. Karan Singh, learned counsel representing the petitioner submitted that the Haryana Staff Selection Commission, Panchkula against Category-19, re-advertised 269 posts of Auction Recorder in the State of Haryana vide advertisement No.7/2015. The last date for submission of online application was 23.11.2015. The eligibility criteria was Graduation with 50% marks from a recognized University or its equivalent with six months Certificate in Computer from a recognized Institution with

Hindi/Sanskrit upto Matric standard or higher education and age 17-42 years. The petitioner submitted the application form and was issued Roll number vide Annexure P-3. The written test was conducted on 15.05.2016. The result was declared on 13.04.2017 and uploaded in April, 2018. Eligible candidates were called for scrutiny of documents two times, but the petitioner could not appear on 02.05.2018 and 04.05.2018 for scrutiny. The respondents are still calling candidates for scrutiny of the documents belonging to SC & SBC categories, whereas the claim of the petitioner is similar to SC category. The department has also given a chance for scrutiny of the documents. The process is going on, thus, the petitioner should also be given a chance.

Ms. Shruti Jain Goyal, learned Deputy Advocate General, Haryana informed the Court that in reference to Annexure P-7, the candidates for scrutiny of documents for the post of Auction Recorder pertained to SC and SBC categories were called. The result belonging to SC category was uploaded and the process is over. The petitioner, as per the admission, could not avail one time chance of scrutiny of documents. His request, in such circumstances, cannot be entertained.

I am afraid that the aforementioned argument of the learned counsel for the petitioner would not be sustainable. The contents of Paragraph 9 of the writ petition are as under:-

“9. That the petitioner could not participate in the scrutiny of the documents held on 02.05.2018 to 04.05.2018 as the petitioner is living in a village and could not get information about the interview and it was only on 09.06.2019 the petitioner got information about the same. On 10.06.2019 the petitioner had approached the office of respondent Commission and submitted representation requesting therein

to conduct her interview. A true copy of the representation is attached herewith as Annexure P-6. ”

Petitioner was given chance on 09.06.2019 to appear for scrutiny of documents, but did not avail and the reasoning assigned is incomprehensible. In such circumstances, perpetual requests of the candidates cannot be accepted, otherwise the process of scrutiny would not be over. The petitioner has missed two chance already. Third chance cannot be granted. Annexure P-8 does not pertain to the documents of the candidates belonging to SC category. It is for those candidates, who are on different platform.

For the reasons mentioned above, no ground for interference is made out. Resultantly, the writ petition is dismissed.

July 08, 2019
ramesh

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No