

Sr. No.304

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

**CWP No.9568 of 2018 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 24.07.2019**

Abhishek Garg and others

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another

... Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

Present:- Mr. Gaurav Rana, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Ms. Ambika Bedi, AAG, Punjab.

ARUN MONGA, J.(ORAL)

After hearing the arguments at some length on
26.10.2018, this Court passed the following order:-

“Main case stands adjourned to 5.2.2019.

It is stated that the petitioners Abhishek Garg (No.1), Shruti Watts (No.2), Ramanpreet Kaur (No.3), Jaspreet Kaur (No.4), Basant Singh (No.6), Loven Singla (No.11), Bhupesh Kumar (No.12), Saurabh Manjal (No.14); and Yashmani Goyal (No.15) undertook the written test for determination of merit and in terms of the interim directions passed by this Court they were also permitted to undertake the qualifying Computer Typing Test in Punjabi and English.

Prayer in the application is for computing their merit and permitting them to appear in the counseling, if they fall in the zone of merit.

Notice of the application.

Ms. Sudeepti Sharma, Addl.AG Punjab accepts

notice and prays for time.

Adjourned to 19.11.2018.

In the meanwhile the result of the petitioners shall be declared and they be permitted to participate in the counseling and in case they fall within the zone of appointment in their respective categories, then equal number of posts shall be kept in abeyance. These appointments shall be subject to the decision of the writ petition.

Copy of the order be supplied to the counsel for the parties under the signatures of the Special Secretary.

To be shown in the urgent list.”

2. A perusal of the above order reflects that petitioners were permitted to participate in the counseling process and pursuant thereto if they were found meritorious enough for appointment in their respective categories then equal number of posts were to be kept in abeyance. It was also made clear that the appointments made pursuant thereto shall be subject to the decision of the writ petition.

3. Learned State counsel appearing for respondents No.1 and 2 submits that pursuant to the above order, in order to avoid any confusion, respondent No.2 has kept the entire appointment process qua the petitioners on hold and no appointments are being made.

4. In the premise, the above order is modified /clarified that in case the petitioners have been found meritorious then the benefit of their merit be accorded to them in accordance with law.

5. Respondents are at liberty to proceed with the process of appointments and order dated 26.10.2018 shall not come in the

way of contemplated appointments.

6. Disposed of accordingly.

24.07.2019
vandana

(ARUN MONGA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No