

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

CWP No.23152 of 2019 (O&M)

Date of Decision.28.08.2019

Priya and others
State of Haryana and another

Vs

...Petitioners
...Respondents

Present: Mr. Suresh Kumar Kaushik , Advocate
for the petitioners.

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

-.-

AMIT RAWAL J. (ORAL)

Challenge in the present writ petition is to the impugned notice dated 10.08.2019 (Anenxure P-10) whereby petitioners are alleged to have not been called for interview by respondent No.2-Haryana Staff Selection Commission.

Mr. Kaushik, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners submitted that respondent No.2 caused an advertisement bearing No.12/2015 dated 10.12.2015 inviting online applications for direct recruitment of Steno Typist, Junior Scale Stenographer, Senior Scale Stenographer with closing date as 25.03.2016. Vide corrigendum dated 26.02.2016 (Annexure P-2), number of posts were increased. Petitioners being duly eligible as per qualifications prescribed therein, submitted applications in different categories.

Vide notice dated 11.10.2017 (Annexure P-3) published examination notice and also criteria for recruitment. Finding applications of petitioners correct and proper from all angles, roll numbers were allotted and examination for categories No.1 to 8 was held between 06.11.2017 to 15.11.2017. Result of written examination was declared and after declaration of result, successful candidates were required to undergo

shorthand and transcription test from 23.04.2018 to 26.04.2018.

Some of the candidates challenged aforementioned notice in this court alleging non-compliance of standard practice of stenography test and vide order dated 07.02.2019 (Annexure P-5), writ petition was disposed of.

Accordingly, notice dated 24.05.2019 (Annexure P-6) was published whereby candidates declared unsuccessful/non-qualified and absent for shorthand and transcription test were given chance to undertake the test from 17.06.2019 to 21.06.2019. On the basis of written examination (Computer Based Test) and shorthand and transcription test, respondent No.2 vide notice dated 18.07.2019 (Annexure P-7) called the candidates for scrutiny of the documents for the post of Junior Scale Stenographer on 27.07.2019 and vide notice dated 24.07.2019 (Annexure P-8) for Steno Typist on 30.07.2019 and 31.07.2019. Petitioners have also been called for scrutiny of documents but no objection was taken regarding their essential qualification. On the basis of scrutiny of documents, respondent No.2 called the candidates for interview on two days i.e. 21.08.2019 and 22.08.2019 (Annexure P-10).

Respondents declared result of written examination only at the stage of interview. Though as per information of petitioners they have qualified written examination and stenography test but have not been called for interview in their respective categories, therefore, the impugned action of respondents, according to Mr. Kaushik, is not sustainable.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioners and appraised the paper book. This Court called upon Mr. Kaushik to corroborate from writ petition or from any document with regard to assertion of having

cleared written examination, the answer was in negative. This Court, in such circumstances, cannot indulge into a roving enquiry and call upon respondents to disclose/declare result of petitioners, as petitioners have independent remedy to seek information under Right to Information Act. In the absence of any material qua passing of written examination by petitioners, I do not find any justification for quashing impugned notice.

No ground for interference is made out. Resultantly, writ petition is dismissed *in limine*.

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

August 28, 2019
Pankaj*

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes

Whether reportable No