

119/211
IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-26920-2018 (O&M)
Date of decision: 16.12.2019

Surinder Kumar and another **.....Petitioners.**

vs.

State of Haryana and others **.....Respondents.**

CORAM: - HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR

Present: - Mr. Manoj Chahal, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Hitesh Pandit, Additional Advocate General, Haryana.

Mr. Parveen Mehta, Advocate for
Mr. Deepak Manchanda, Advocate for respondent No. 3.

.....

Sanjay Kumar, J. (ORAL)

The grievance of the petitioners was that they were not being considered for promotion to the post of Accountant on the ground that they did not have the requisite service in the category of Clerk. It was their case that this benefit was allowed to two Sanitary Inspectors who were junior to them but they were not being granted the same relief.

By order dated 22.10.2018 passed in this writ petition, this Court directed that the petitioners should be provisionally allowed to participate in the examination and their results were directed to be kept in a sealed cover. CM-10861-CWP-2019 was filed thereafter, seeking a direction to declare the result of the petitioners.

On 18.9.2019, the result of the petitioners was produced and perusal thereof reflected that Surinder Kumar, the first petitioner, secured 202.5 marks out of 500 marks (less than 45%), while Nidhi Garg, the second petitioner, secured 232 marks out of 500 marks (above 45%). At

the request of the State counsel, the matter was adjourned.

Mr. Hitesh Pandit, learned Additional Advocate General, Haryana, appearing for respondents No. 1 and 2, would inform this Court that his office received communication dated 13.12.2019, from the Superintendent (Establishment) acting on behalf of the Director Urban Local Bodies, Haryana, Panchkula, wherein he stated that the case of Nidhi Garg, the second petitioner, was considered by the competent authority as she passed five papers and secured more than 45 % marks. She was accordingly promoted as an Accountant, vide order dated 27.11.2019. The Superintendent (Establishment) further stated that Surinder Kumar, the first petitioner, did not secure the required passing marks as well as the minimum aggregate of 45% marks and therefore, he stood outside the zone of consideration.

In light of the aforesaid developments, the grievance of the petitioners stood settled by the interim order itself. No further adjudication is warranted in this writ petition. The writ petition is accordingly disposed of.

In consequence, CM-10861-CWP-2019 shall also stand disposed of.

No order as to costs.

(SANJAY KUMAR)
JUDGE

16.12.2019

preeti

whether speaking/non speaking

yes/no

whether reportable/non reportable

yes/no