

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

CWP No. 15294 of 2021

DATE OF DECISION : 24.08.2021

Sunita

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

Present : Mr. Vijay Dahiya, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Saurabh Mohunta, DAG, Haryana.

(Presence marked through video conferencing).

ARUN MONGA, J. (ORAL)

Petition herein, inter-alia, is for issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari, seeking quashing of impugned order dated 04.01.2020 (Annexure P-4). Further prayer has been made for issuing directions to the respondents to provide the details of marks obtained by the petitioner as well as the selected candidates.

2. Learned State counsel submits that pursuant to order dated 11.08.2021, he is in receipt of result of the petitioner. Same reflects that she has obtained an aggregate of 39.04 marks in OBC category, in which she had applied, as against 56.41 marks obtained by respondent No.4 (namely Divya Rani). He submits that on that short ground alone, no further proceedings are required. The writ petition is not maintainable as the same

has been filed under the misleading impression that petitioner is more meritorious and had obtained more marks as compared to respondent No.4,

3. On a Court query, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that selection criteria advertised vide Exhibit P-3 is not under challenge before this Court. Criteria envisages clearly that preference will be given to the candidates belonging to the district where the appointment is to be made and to that extent, respondent No.3 since belongs to Panipat, she has rightly been given benefit of additional 20 marks.

4. On further query, learned counsel for the petitioner also does not deny that the petitioner indeed belongs to Sonipat and therefore, she is not entitled to seek any district benefit and awarding of special marks on that basis.

5. In the premise, additional 20 marks have been rightly denied to the petitioner as she concededly does not belong to Panipat and therefore, cannot claim parity on the same footing as respondent no.3. Being so, no grounds are made out for any further interference.

6. Dismissed.

AUGUST 23, 2021
Shalini

(ARUN MONGA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No