

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH**CWP-1016-2020 (O&M)****Date of Decision: September 13, 2022**

Rahul

.....Petitioner

versus

Haryana Staff Selection Commission

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA**Present:** Mr. Sumit Sangwan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Pankaj Middha, Addl.A.G., Haryana.

ARUN MONGA, J. (ORAL)

Petition herein, *inter alia*, is for issuance of a writ in the nature of Certiorari for quashing notice dated 14.08.2019 (Annexure P-5) and result dated 20.09.2019 (Annexure P-6) qua the post of Steno-Typist (English) in Category No.1 of Advt. No.12/2015 (Annexure P-1).

2. Pledged case is that petitioner appeared for written examination and shorthand test in general category. The respondent-Commission vide notice dated 28.07.2019 (Annexure P-4) called for the candidates for scrutiny of documents for the post in question, wherein the petitioner also appeared before the Commission. However, in the notice (Annexure P-5) issued by the Commission whereby, the candidates were called for interview, the petitioner's name did not figure therein. Respondent-Commission declared the final result on 20.09.2019 (Annexure P-6), per which cut-off marks in General Category are 122. The maximum marks are 225 marks, with a break up of 200 marks for written examination and 25 marks for interview.

3. Petitioner being confident that he had secured 120 marks in written examination, approached the Commission under the RTI Act but no information was supplied to him. Hence, present petition.

4. Pursuant to a previous order dated 19.02.2020, result of the petitioner has been brought in a sealed cover in the Court today. Same is opened and marked as Annexure 'A'. A copy of the same has been handed over to learned counsel for the petitioner. Perusal of the same reveals that petitioner has secured 84 marks in written examination. The cut off for the waiting list of General Category is 94 marks. Petitioner was under clearly under wrong impression that he had secured 120 marks in the written examination.

5. In the premise, it seems that being unaware of his actual result, the petitioner was misled into filing the instant petition premised on an misunderstanding, as aforesaid.

6. The result of the petitioner is not under challenge before this Court. Being so, no further grounds to interfere are made out.

7. Dismissed.

(ARUN MONGA)
JUDGE

September 13, 2022
ashish

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No