

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

CWP-18139-2021

Date of decision: 14.09.2021

Jagram

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

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

Mr. Saurabh Mohunta, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

(Presence marked through video conference).

ARUN MONGA, J. (ORAL)

Grievance of the petitioner is qua delay in deciding his case by the competent authority with respect to his selection on the post of Clerk. He pleads that despite his having made all out efforts, running from pillar to post and having submitted various representations from time to time, no action has been taken.

The present writ petition has been filed seeking quashing order dated 12.05.2021 (Annexure P-10) vide which while disposing of the complaint/ representation of the petitioner with regard to recruitment to the post of Clerks in pursuance to Advertisement No. 01/1986 and 04/1987, it was informed that name of the applicant bearing Roll No. 106896, Merit No. 4013, who belongs to SC Category, is Jagraj. According to the petitioner, Roll Number 106896 assigned to him, is stated to be correct as per his admit card dated 01.08.1988 issued to him at the relevant time when the advertisement was issued in April, 1987 by erstwhile Subordinates Services Section Board Haryana now Haryana Staff Selection Commission.

According to the petitioner, the reason given for not offering him appointment is stated to be an error in recording his name as Jagraj instead of Jagram on the part of respondent No.2.

Further prayer of the petitioner is to issue directions to the respondents to issue him the appointment letter to the post of Clerk, being in merit, as per judgment passed by Division Bench in LPA No. 1509 of 2010 dated 09.11.2012 (Annexure P-2) with all consequential benefits.

Be that as it may, given the sheer colossal delay in the nature of relief being sought by the petitioner from this Court under extraordinary writ jurisdiction, this Court would refrain to interfere at this stage. Concededly, the petitioner had competed for the post of Clerk qua the advertisement issued in 1987 and his age was 24 years at that time and as on today after a lapse of 34 years, he should be on or about 58 years of age and, therefore, on this ground alone, writ petition is dismissed.

14.09.2021
Vandana/vs

(ARUN MONGA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasonable:
Whether reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No