

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

CWP No.20423 of 2019

Date of Decision: August 17, 2019

Chander Pal & others

...Petitioners

Versus

Haryana Staff Selection Commission

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present: Mr. Vikram Sheoran, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

AMIT RAWAL, J. (Oral)

Grievance of the petitioners in the present case is for rejection of their application forms (Annexure P-4) and in this regard made a representation (Annexure P-5).

Mr. Vikram Sheoran, learned counsel representing the petitioners submitted that in response to the advertisement, Annexure P-2, dated 15.06.2019, Haryana Staff Selection Commission invited applications for filling up 1624 posts of Junior Engineers mentioned under various categories, i.e., categories No.1 to 35 in different departments, i.e., Development and Panchayat, Public Health, Engineering, Horticulture, Haryana Dairy Development Cooperative Federation, PWD (B&R), Marketing Board, Board of School Education, Haryana, Agriculture, HVPNL, Haryana, Police Housing Corporation, Haryana, Housing Board, Kurukshetra Development Board, Kurukshetra, Hafed, Urban Local Bodies,

Municipal Corporation etc.

Petitioner applied in various categories by filing application forms, which have been accepted by the computer. Petitioner No.1 applied in BCA category, but his form has been rejected in category No.10 on the ground that he did not belong to eligible reservation category and in categories No.22 and 24 on the ground that he did not fulfill the age criteria. Similarly, petitioner No.2 applied in SC category, but his application form under categories No.10, 11, 20 and 22 was rejected on the ground that he did not fulfill the age criteria. Petitioner No.3 applied in BCB category under various categories, but his application form under categories No.10 and 22 has been rejected as he did not fulfill the age criteria. In some of categories, post for their reserved categories are not available in which they were eligible and, thus, they could not apply under general category and their application forms under general category have been rejected online. In this regard, petitioners made a representation to the respondent, which is still pending.

I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioners and appraised the paper book.

Annexure P-3 is the application form of petitioner No.1, wherein he has been referred as BCA category, whereas categories No.10 and 22 are for general category. There is no bar for a reserved candidate to apply under general category. Only he/she is to be meritorious, but once there is no reservation, obviously the website would not accept the form. This is what precisely is the rejection reflected in part of Annexure P-4 at pages 54-55 of the paper book. I do not find any ground to grant indulgence to the petitioners while issuing writ of mandamus. No ground for

interference is made out. Resultantly, writ petition is dismissed.

August 17, 2019
ramesh

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable:	Yes/No