

In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

CWP No. 6852 of 2012 (O&M)
Date of Decision: March 25, 2019

Manpreet Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

Punjab State Agricultural Marketing Board and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

Present: Mr. Ankit Aggarwal, Advocate,
for Mr. S.B. Kaushik, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

None for respondents no.1 and 2.

Mr. G.S. Bal, Sr. Advocate with
Ms. Gursimran Kaur, Advocate,
for respondents no. 3 to 5.

Arun Monga, J. (Oral)

Present writ petition has been filed, *inter alia*, for issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari to quash impugned selection list for the posts of Clerks (Annexure P/9), whereby, respondents no. 3 to 5 have been selected and the claim of the petitioner was rejected.

2. The short controversy that arises for consideration is that the petitioner had applied for the post of Clerk, in the category of dependents of Ex-servicemen, while the stand of respondents is that petitioner did not submit the requisite certificate showing that he is dependent of Ex-serviceman.

3. In the premise, this Court vide order dated 28.07.2015, directed the Secretary of the respondent – Punjab State Agricultural Marketing

Board, to inquire into the alleged discrepancy of not submitting the certificate of Dependent of Ex-servicemen and submit a report in sealed cover before this Court. In compliance thereof, an inquiry report dated 20.01.2016 was produced in a sealed cover and upon examination of the same vide order dated 15.07.2016, this Court observed that the petitioner had indeed not submitted the requisite certificate on the day of counseling i.e. on 19.10.2011.

4. In this view of the matter, I do not see any infirmity in the action of the respondents, in not considering the petitioner for appointment against the category of Dependents of Ex-servicemen, as he did not submit the certificate in accordance with the procedure prescribed by the respondent-Board. As regards the indictment of the petitioner, by the Inquiry Officer, he is at liberty to challenge the enquiry report dated 20.01.2016 in appropriate proceedings.

5. With these observations, present petition is dismissed.

March 25, 2019

vk d

(Arun Monga)
Judge

Whether speaking / reasoned : Yes / No

Whether reportable : Yes / No