# IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

*CWP No.5831 of 2020*
*Date of decision : 22.12.2020*

Tara Chand ... Petitioner

*Versus*

*Himachal Pradesh State Electricity Board.* ...Respondents

*Coram:*

**The Hon'ble Mr. Justice L. Narayana Swamy, Chief Justice.**
**The Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anoop Chitkara, Judge.**

*Whether approved for reporting?*[1]

For the Petitioner : Mr. Amit Jamwal, Advocate.

For the Respondents : Mr. Anil Kumar God, Advocate

PROCEEDINGS CONVENED THROUGH VIDEO CONFERENCING

Anoop Chitkara, Judge (oral)

Pursuant to advertisement dated 4th June, 2020 issued by Himachal Pradesh State Electricity Board for the post of Junior T-Mate, 2020 the petitioner had applied for the same.

2. The petitioner contends that he had posted the application form on 15th July, 2020 and annexed the postal receipt as Annexure P-3. The case of the petitioner is that the respondents displayed the list of successful candidates but the name of the petitioner does not find mention in the same list. On inquiry from the postal department, it was confirmed that the respondents had received his application form. He further states that he has sent the form by registered post on 15th July, 2020 and as per the normal practice, it was supposed to reach on the next day. He states that the interview for the said post had been

[1] **Whether reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgment?**

scheduled w.e.f. 10th to 12th December, 2020. A coordinate Bench of this Court in ***CWP No. 5691 of 2020*** titled ***Amit Kumar*** versus ***Himachal Pradesh State Electricity Board & Others*** permitted the petitioner therein to participate in the interview on the similar facts. Thus, his claim is that he be also permitted to participate in the interview.

3. Mr. Anil Kumar God, learned counsel representing the respondents-Board submitted that the last date for receipt of application form was 20th July, 2020. He states, on instructions, that all those candidates, whose forms were received within time, were invited for interview. He further submits that the interviews had taken place w.e.f. 10th December, 2020 to 12th December, 2020 and now are over.

4. In response to the query of this Court that what prejudice would it cause if the respondents permit the petitioner to appear in the interview by constituting an interview Board, Mr. Anil Kumar God, learned counsel appearing for the respondents-Board submitted, on instructions, that in all, 6511 candidates were not called for interview because their applications were not received well in time. He states that if the petitioner is permitted to appear then all such candidates would also claim the same relief. It would be prejudicial to the candidates, who had sent their applications well in time and had complied with the terms of advertisement.

5. Given the fact that the advertisement was issued on 4th June, 2020, the petitioner kept on waiting and applied on 15th July, 2020, wherein the last date of receiving the application was 20th July, 2020. It was for the petitioner to apply within the reasonable time. If the dealy is on the part of the postal department then respondents cannot be burdended with the same.

6. Given above, there is no merit in the petition and the same is accordingly dismissed. Pending application(s), if any, are closed.

(L. Narayana Swamy)
Chief Justice

(Anoop Chitkara),
Judge

December 22, 2020 (Himani)