

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-6806-2021

Date of Decision: 14.10.2021

DINESH KADIAN

..... Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

..... Respondent(s)

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE LISA GILL

Present: Mr. Tejpal Singh Dhull, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ranjeesh Chadwal, AAG, Haryana.

LISA GILL, J.

Though matters were being taken up through physical hearing mode today, this matter has been taken up through video conferencing on specific request of learned counsel and in terms of circular dated 14.09.2021.

This writ petition has been filed for directing respondent no.2 to issue a corrigendum qua advertisement no.13/2019 (Annexure P-1) or to re-advertise the said posts as it is stated that selection process has not been initiated for such a long period and petitioner in the interregnum has become eligible to participate in the selection process.

Notice of motion was issued in this writ petition while noting contention of the petitioner, as under:-

“It is inter alia submitted that the petitioner wishes to apply for the post of PGT teacher advertised in August, 2019 as he could not apply till date being unqualified. He had not passed the HTET test. The

selection process has remained at the initial stages of inviting applications and the last date was extended till 02.03.2020. Even thereafter, no action has been taken to proceed with the selection process and meanwhile, the petitioner has passed the HTET test in the year 2020. Thus, he may also be permitted to apply for the said selection process.”

Though short reply on behalf of respondent no.1 has been filed, learned counsel for the State, on instructions from Mr. Dikansh Goyal, Legal Officer, Haryana Staff Selection Commission, submits that matter has been considered by respondent no.2, and it has been decided that appropriate notice shall be issued, to enable participation in the selection process, of candidates like petitioner who have attained eligibility after issuance of the advertisement in 2019. In this view of the matter, it is submitted that this writ petition is rendered infructuous. Learned counsel for the petitioner is unable to deny the same.

Accordingly, this writ petition is disposed of as infructuous. Needless to say, in case any grievance as raised in the writ petition still exists by virtue of non-issuance of notice as stated above, liberty is afforded to petitioner to move an appropriate application. It is clarified that there is no expression of opinion on the merits of this case.

(Lisa Gill)
Judge

14.10.2021

Sunil

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