

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

CWP No.3880 of 2000 (O&M)

Date of decision: 23.05.2022

Ravinder Kumar

...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 consider the claim of the petitioner for appointment to the post of Gram Sachiv.

2. Petition was admitted on 13.12.2001.

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 21 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 No.1 of the reply filed on behalf of respondent Nos.1 and 2, which are reproduced herein below for ready reference:-

“ 1. That the petitioner has filed this writ petition for issuance of writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to consider claim of the petitioner for appointment as Gram

Sachiv. In this regard it is submitted that mere selection of the petitioners by recruiting agency does not create a right for appointment. It will be relevant to mention here that respondent No.3 has never recommended the names of the petitioners to the answering respondents for their appointment as Gram Sachiv even a copy of result published by the respondent No.3 was never conveyed to the answering respondents. Respondent No.3 has only sent reply on 02.12.1999 (Annexure R-II) in response to the letter dated 19.11.1999 (Annexure R-I) issued by the Panchayat Department to the respondent No.3, whereby it has been conveyed that they have published the result of selected candidates for Gram Sachivs in the various newspapers, prior to this communication, respondent No.3 was intimated by the answering respondent vide letter dated 19.11.1999 (Annexure R-I) that after abolition of octroi in the State, the State Government has decided that the surplus staff of Local Bodies has to be adjusted in different departments, Boards, Corporation/State Public undertakings, and that it has been decided by the Council of Ministers that all the requisitions made by the Government departments to the Staff Selection Commission Haryana/Employment Exchanges in respect of Group 'C' and 'D' posts be withdrawn. In the given circumstances, it is submitted that the claim of the petitioner is liable to be rejected on this ground alone."

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.

23.05.2022
hemlata

(ARUN MONGA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:
Whether reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No