

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP No.195111 of 2019

Date of Decision: July 19, 2019

Dinesh Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana & another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present: Mr. S.S.Sahu, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

AMIT RAWAL, J.

The challenge in the present writ petition is to the action of the respondents in not incorporating the name and roll number of the petitioner in the waiting list despite having secured 151 marks with a further prayer of issuance of writ in the nature of mandamus directing respondent No.2 to take the decision on the representation dated 15.03.2019 (Annexure P-11) and reminder dated 28.05.2019 (Annexure P-12).

Mr. S.S.Sahu, learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that in pursuance to advertisement No.10/2015, various posts including the post of Clerk against Category No.01 were sought to be filled by providing essential qualification, which reads as under:-

“i) 10+2/10+2 First Division/Graduation or its equivalent from a recognized Board/University.

ii) Hindi/Sanskrit upto Matric standard or higher education.

Age: 17-42 years.

Pay Scale: Rs.5200-20200+Rs.1900 GP”

Petitioner being permanent resident of State of Haryana having domicile certificate and all requisite qualifications including the Scheduled Caste Certificate applied for the aforementioned post online and was accordingly issued admit card for written test. The result of the written test was declared on 09.10.2017. Petitioner was found to be successful. He was called for scrutiny of documents and as well as for interview. Petitioner secured 151 marks, whereas the persons kept in the waiting list were also having same marks, but his name did not figure in the waiting list. In this regard, submitted representations Annexures P-11 and P-12.

I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, appraised the paper book and of the view that the writ petition is liable to be dismissed on sole ground, for, it is general law that the waiting list is for only one year. Result was declared in July, 2018. Its tenure has expired. Petitioner could have approached this Court in time for such claim. Writ petition is devoid of merit. No ground for interference is made out.

Dismissed.

July 19, 2019
ramesh

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No