IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH.

111

Civil Writ Petition No.12459 of 2021 (O&M)
Date of Decision: July 13, 2021

Yadav Kumari Poonam

.....Petitioner.

VERSUS

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondent.

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE G. S. SANDHAWALIA

Present: Mr. Neeraj Yadav, Advocate
for the petitioner.

(The proceedings are being conducted through video conferencing, as per instructions)

****

G.S. SANDHAWALIA, J.(Oral)

By filing the present civil writ petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, petitioner seeks direction to the respondents to call her for the scrutiny of documents on the ground that similarly situated candidates have been called by the respondent-commission as the selection process is still going on.

Perusal of the paper-book would go on to show that the advertisement in question is No.4 of 2015 dated 28.06.2015 (Annexure P-1) for which the petitioner had applied for the post of PGT (Economics) under BC-B category. It is own case of the petitioner that she had appeared for the exam on 20.03.2016 and the result was declared and the selected candidates were called for scrutiny of documents between 03.04.2017 to 10.04.2017 by the respondent-Commission vide Annexure P-3.

It is the own case of the petitioner that she could not appear before the Commission for scrutiny of documents and thus, she remained in

SACHIN MEHTA
2021.07.14 14:23
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document
High Court, Chandigarh

a state of slumber and only approached this Court by filing CWP No.6322 of 2020, after a period of three years which was dismissed as withdrawn on 09.04.2021 (Annexure P-4) with liberty to re-file the same with amended prayer.

The contention now raised that the candidates are still being called as per notice dated 01.07.2021 (Annexure P-5) is baseless in as much as three candidates, who have been recommended by the Commission vide said advertisement (Annexure P-1) but were absent for documents verification were being asked to appear on 06.07.2021. It is not the case of the petitioner that her name, at any point of time, was recommended at the initial stage by the Commission. Admittedly, she had not appeared before the Commission for documents verification on account of personal difficulties. The advertisement in question is of the year 2015 i.e. more than 6 years have gone and the petitioner is under impression that she still has a right to seek appointment or consideration of the same. She herself has not opted to join the process within a reasonable time nor agitated her grievance immediately thereafter.

Nothing has been placed on record that any representation has been filed by her in the year 2017 or 2018, claiming that selection process is continuing and the petitioner was entitled for second chance for scrutiny of document. In such circumstances, this Court does not feel that it is a fit case to entertain the writ petition at this belated stage.

Dismissed in limine.

(G. S. SANDHAWALIA)
JUDGE

July 13, 2021
Sachin M.

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No

SACHIN MEHTA
2021.07.14 14:23
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document
High Court, Chandigarh