

Sr. No.595

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH
CWP-18236-1999 (O&M)
Date of decision: 19.05.2022

Zile Singh

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

Present: None for the petitioner.

Mr. R.D.Sharma, DAG, Haryana.

ARUN MONGA, J. (ORAL)

Petition herein, *inter alia*, is for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to appoint the petitioner as conductor and give all other benefits which are admissible to him.

2. Petition was admitted on 31.01.2003.

3. When called out for hearing, there is no representation on behalf of the petitioner. It seems that by sheer effluxion of time and pendency of the writ petition for more than 22 years before this Court, either it has been rendered infructuous or even otherwise the petitioner seems to have lost interest in pursuing the same.

4. In any case, it appears that even on merits, claim of the petitioner is not admissible in view of the following stand taken in para 2 and 6 of the reply, which are reproduced herein below for ready reference:-

“ 2. That in reply to para No.2 of the Civil Writ petition, it is submitted that the requisition for filling up the 20 posts of conductors was sent to Employment Exchange, Rewari by the General Manager, Haryana Roadways, Rewari. Accordingly, the employment exchange recommended the names of eligible candidates from which 20 conductors were selected by the Selection Board consisting of General Manager, Traffic Manager under the chairmanship of Joint State Transport Controller (A), Haryana on the basis of interview hold on 31.08.1988. The petitioner was also selected in the said interview dated 31.08.88 and his name was kept at Sr. No.17 of

the list of selected candidates for the post of conductor. Besides this, 18 candidates were kept in waiting list.

XXX

XXX

6. *In reply to para No.6 of the civil writ petition, it is submitted that Transport Commissioner, Haryana vide endst. No.4160-77A-3/E-3 dated 14.08.92 issued instructions wherein it was desired that whenever, there is fresh recruitment the earlier surplus removed employees must be given first priority and issued letter offering them employment. The said guidelines were followed in toto while making recruitment. It is wrong to say that pick and choose policy was adopted by the respondents."*

5. I am in agreement with the stand taken by the respondents as aforesaid. Neither any replication has been filed to the afore noted stand of the respondents nor any additional affidavit of any kind to controvert the same.

6. In view of the aforesaid, no grounds are made out to interfere.

7. Dismissed.

19.05.2022

vandana

(ARUN MONGA)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes/No

Whether reportable:

Yes/No