

(110) IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.14097 of 2017
Date of decision: 06.05.2019

Arun Kumar and others

..... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

.... Respondents

BEFORE: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B.S. WALIA.

Present: None for the petitioners.
Ms. Shruti Jain Goyal, DAG, Haryana.

B.S. WALIA, J. (ORAL)

[1] Learned DAG contends that selections for the post of Constable(s) were as per four tiers selection criteria i.e. Physical Screening Test (PST), Written Knowledge Test (KT), Physical Measurement Test (PMT) and Interview-cum-Personality Test in respective order and the Written Knowledge Test was conducted only in case of candidates qualifying the Physical Screening Test (PST).

[2] Learned DAG contends that the Physical Screening Test (PST) of all the petitioners was conducted from 15.06.2016 to 23.07.2016, but the petitioners did not qualify the same, as a result of which they were ineligible for appearing in the written test which was scheduled to be held on 28.08.2016. However, the petitioners did not challenge their ineligibility and filed the writ petition on 21.06.2017 only after orders had been passed on 08.05.2017 by Hon'ble Division Bench in LPA No.1590 of 2016 in case

titled as Vivek Singh & Ors. v. State of Haryana & Ors. in which on the concession given by the respondents, a fresh Physical Screening Test (PST) of the candidates in the LPA was conducted.

[3] Learned DAG states that the Hon'ble Division Bench made it clear that the concession of re-examination of Physical Screening Test (PST) was limited only to those candidates who had invoked the jurisdiction of this Court till date whereas the petitioners filed the writ petition only on 21.06.2017.

Learned DAG contends that being a fence sitter and the writ petition having been filed after delay of close to one year, the petitioners are not entitled to any relief.

[4] Despite the case having been called out twice, none is present on behalf of the petitioners. For that matter, even on the last date of hearing (i.e. 30.04.2019), adjournment had been taken on account of non-availability of learned arguing counsel.

[5] In the circumstances, it appears that the petitioners are not interested in pursuing the writ petition.

[6] Dismissed in default.

06.05.2019
amit

(B.S. Walia)
Judge

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