

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

CWP-11313-2017

Date of decision:- 15.01.2020

Pawan Kumar and others

.....Petitioners

vs.

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RITU BAHRI

Present:- Ms. Sunita Punia, Advocate for
Mr. Rajiv Kataria, Advocate
for the petitioners.

RITU BAHRI, J. (Oral)

The petitioners are challenging selection list (Annexures P-11 and P-12) whereby appointments of Group-D employees have been made. Respondent No.2 had invited applications for recruitment of 48 posts of various categories of regular mechanical establishment (Group-D) employees in Kaithal circle vide advertisement dated 13.03.2013 (Annexure P-1). The petitioners participated in the selection process and their application forms are Annexures P-2 to P-8. The Committee of four members was constituted for recruitment of staff in various circles vide office order dated 28.11.2013 (Annexure P-10). Thereafter final selection list (Annexures P-11 and P-12) was prepared by which respondents No. 4 to 38 had been selected.

The grievance of the petitioners is that fixed marks for middle, matric and 10+2 have not been given to the petitioners.

On notice, written statement dated 08.08.2017 has been filed on behalf of respondents Nos. 1 to 3. It is stated in para 10 of the reply that

merit list has been prepared on the basis of academic qualification, experience, personality test and percentage of marks in 8th, 10th and 10+2. Marks obtained in 8th, 10th and 10+2 have been divided by 100 and multiplied by 15, 15 and 20 respectively and due percentage has been awarded on the basis of marks secured in 8th, 10th and 10+2. So percentage of total marks in 8th, 10th and 10+2 has been converted as marks out of 15, 15 and 20 marks. Details of the marks awarded to respondents No. 4 to 38 have been given in Annexure R/7 and the marks have been awarded correctly. Hence the ground to challenge the selection is not made out. Moreover, the final result was declared on 18.07.2014 and the writ petition was filed on 20.03.2017 i.e. after lapse of around three years when all the selected candidates had already joined and they completed their probation period as well. Further no replication has been filed to the written statement.

With theses observations, writ petition is dismissed.

(RITU BAHRI)
JUDGE

15.01.2020
Divyanshi

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No