

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

Date of decision: September 06, 2022

1. CWP-3235-2002 (O&M)

Dr. Surinder Kumar
.....Petitioner
versus
State of Haryana and others
.....Respondents

2. CWP-2083-2000 (O&M)

Anil Kumar
.....Petitioner
versus
State of Haryana and others
.....Respondents

3. CWP-10303-1999 (O&M)

Anil Kumar Kaushik and others
.....Petitioners
versus
State of Haryana and others
.....Respondents

4. CWP-10484-1999 (O&M)

Arvind Kumar Tyagi
.....Petitioner
versus
State of Haryana and others
.....Respondents

CORAM: HON’BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

Present: None for the petitioner(s) in CWP-3235-2002.

Mr. Jviesh Malik, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) in CWP-2083-2000.

Mr. I.S. Sidhu, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) in CWP-10303-1999.

None for the petitioner(s) in CWP-10484-1999.

Mr. R.D. Sharma, DAG Haryana.

Dr. Neha Awasthi Ban, Advocate for the respondent-HPSC.

Mr. Samrat Malik, Advocate
for respondents No.6 to 8 in CWP-3235-2002
for respondents No.6 to 8 in CWP-2083-2000
for respondents No.5 to 7 in CWP-10303-1999 and
for respondents No.4 to 6 in CWP-10484-1999.

ARUN MONGA, J. (ORAL)

Vide this common order, bunch of above-mentioned writ petitions are being disposed of, since not only the facts but the law points and the issues raised therein are also similar. For brevity, recitals are taken from CWP No.3235-2002.

2. Petition herein, *inter alia*, is for issuance of a writ in the nature of Certiorari for quashing the selection and appointment of respondents No.6 to 8 on the post of Divisional Soil Conservation Officers vide order dated 20.08.1999 (Annexure P-14), allegedly being ineligible, as they did not fulfill the essential relevant experience as prescribed in the Advertisement. Further a writ in the nature of Mandamus has been sought to prepare a fresh selection list after calling eligible candidates including the petitioner for interview according to merit.

3. Petition was admitted for hearing on 04.03.2002.

4. In this bunch of petitions, none appears on behalf of the petitioner(s) in CWP-3235-2002 and in CWP-10484-1999. Learned counsel(s) for the other petitioner(s) state that they are unable to assist the Court for lack of instructions. They state that despite attempts, their office could not contact the petitioner(s). In the premise, no useful purpose would

be served by issue of fresh notice to the petitioners as the same too would be an exercise in futility.

5. Whereas, learned counsel for the State also submits that he made attempts to get instructions from the office representatives of the respondents, but for lack of any assistance, he is unable to address arguments.

6. It seems that by sheer effluxion of time and pendency of the writ petition for more than 20 years before this Court, either it has been rendered infructuous or even otherwise the petitioners seem to have lost interest in pursuing the same.

7. Be that as it may, writ petition is disposed of with liberty to the petitioners to file an appropriate application in case any cause of action still survives.

8. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(ARUN MONGA)
JUDGE

September 06, 2022
mahavir

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No