

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

224

CWP No.1895 of 2019

Date of Decision: 16.09.2022

Minakshi Chaman

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. Satyaveer Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sandeep Singh Mann, Addl. AG, Haryana.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J. (Oral)

In the present petition, the grievance which is being raised by the petitioner is that the petitioner be given an opportunity to be interviewed and to be considered for an appointment to the post of PGT History as advertised vide advertisement No.04/2015 dated 28.06.2015 after granting another opportunity to the petitioner to get her documents scrutinized.

After issuing notice of motion, respondents have filed reply wherein they have mentioned that after the written examination, the candidates were given number of opportunities to appear for scrutiny so that, their eligibility could be assessed to be further called for interview but the petitioner never appeared and remained absent and never availed even one of the various chances which were given to her so as to prove her eligibility.

There is no replication to the said written statement.

In the present case, nothing has come on record as to what prevented the petitioner from appearing in the scrutiny so as to prove her eligibility. The petitioner is claiming appointment in pursuance to the advertisement of the year 2015 and as per the respondents, the said selection

has already been finalized since long.

Be that, the claim of the petitioner cannot be considered again especially when, the fault lies with the petitioner of not availing the various chances given to her for the scrutiny of the document to prove her eligibility.

As per the terms and conditions of the advertisement, a candidate who does not appear in the scrutiny, could not be called for interview. Hence even as per the advertisement, petitioner, now at this stage, cannot claim another opportunity so as to scrutinize her documents.

No interference is called for by this Court keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case noted hereinbefore.

The petition is accordingly dismissed.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

16.09.2022
manju

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No

Whether reportable Yes/No