

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

218

Date of Decision: 11.03.2019

[1]

CWP No.22819 of 2014

Sanjay Kumar and others

...Petitioners

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

[2]

CWP No.4794 of 2016

Mohinder Singh and others

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

[3]

CWP No.2919 of 2016

Rajesh Kumar

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE RAJIV NARAIN RAINA

Present: Mr.S.S.Duhan, Advocate
for the petitioner (CWP No.22819 of 2014)
Mr.V.B.Aggarwal, Advocate
for the petitioner (CWP No.2919 of 2016).
Mr.IPS Issar Advocate
for the petitioner (CWP No.4794 of 2016).
Mr.Jagbir Mor, Advocate
for the petitioner (CWP No.21782 of 2017).
Mr. Harish Rathee, Sr. DAG, Haryana.
Mr.Subhash Rana, Advocate
for respondents No.47 and 122 (CWP No.22819 of 2014)
and CWP No. 4794 of 2016.
Mr.Manoj Sharma, Advocate
for respondent No.107 (CWP No.22819 of 23014)
Mr.Satbir Mor, Advocate for respondent No.115.
Mr.Gourav Jhangra, Advocate for
Mr.Ramesh Chahal, Advocate
for respondents No.19 to 22, 24, 27 & 31 to 40
(CWP No.22819 of 2014).

Mr.S.P.Chahar, Advocate
for respondents No.50, 105, 110, 116 to 120.
Mr.S.S.Thakur, Advocate for
Mr.J.P. Rana, Advocate
for respondents No.16 & 17 (CWP No.22819 of 2014).
Mr.Manoj Sharma, Advocate
for respondent No.107 (CWP No.22819 of 2014).

RAJIV NARAIN RAINA, J. (Oral)

CM No.6380 of 2018 in
CWP No.22819 of 2014

Application is allowed as prayed for. Amended memo of parties is taken on record.

CWP No.22819 of 2014;
CWP No.4794 of 2016 &
CWP No.2919 of 2016

All the aforesaid writ petitions are disposed of by this common order as the law and facts involved therein are the same.

Learned counsel for the respondents relies upon the judgment of this Court in CWP No.746 of 2009 titled “Kishan Sahai and others Vs. State of Haryana and others” decided on 1.11.2017 wherein all the aspects of the selection process of heavy vehicle drivers under advertisement No.1/12 have been extensively dealt with and no fault has been found with the selection process.

The issues raised in these cases are clearly governed by the ratio of the aforesaid judgment which though relates to previous selection of heavy vehicle drivers, but the grounds are materially the same. No new ground is raised in these petitions which may require further consideration.

I have gone through the grounds taken in this petition and read the judgment and order in *Kishan Sahai* case and find no dissimilarity for me

to enter in any discussion on this case. No window is left for this Court to express opinion on any issue in this case on which the fate of the selection process may turn in favour of the petitioners. Therefore, I find no merit in these writ petitions and the same are dismissed.

It may be pointed out that in CWP No.2919 of 2016, notice of motion has been issued for 17.03.2016. As per office report, process fee has not been deposited so far. I would have dismissed the said case for non-prosecution, but refrain from doing so since I have heard all the connected matters for disposal and Mr.V.B.Aggarwal's case would be covered by this order.

(RAJIV NARAIN RAINA)
JUDGE

11.03.2019
sd/Vimal

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	:	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	:	<i>Yes/No</i>