

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND
HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.10088 of 2019 (O&M)

Date of Decision.07.04.2022

Sandeep

...Petitioner

Vs

State of Haryana and another

...Respondents

CORAM:HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present: None for the petitioner.

Ms. Upasana Dhawan, AAG, Haryana.

-. -

JAISHREE THAKUR J. (ORAL)

The instant writ petition has been filed seeking writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing the final result dated 28.02.2019 published for the post of Male Constable (General Duty) by Advertisement No.3/2018, Category No.1 on the ground that name of the petitioner has not been reflected therein; further relief has also been sought for appointment to the said post by considering his candidature for grant of 5 marks for socio-economic criteria, which had not been awarded to him.

The petitioner herein had applied for the post of Male Constable (GD) against the said advertisement and thereafter, appeared for the written test as a general candidate. The petitioner cleared the physical screening test and the physical measurement test, however, found that no marks had been awarded to him towards his socio-economic criterion. The petitioner had given an undertaking while submitting the form that none of the family members of the petitioner is in government service and therefore, if 5 marks are awarded to him, his score would be 61.8 marks as against the

last selected candidate, who had secured 57.60 marks.

Notice of motion was issued and a short reply has been filed today by the Under Secretary, Haryana Staff Selection Commission, Panchkula on behalf of respondent No.2 wherein it has been submitted that the petitioner would be entitled for 5 marks under the socio-economic criteria. Taking his written marks into account and the 5 marks as awarded to the petitioner, a recommendation for his appointment has been sent to the Department.

Counsel for the respondent-State would submit that since name of the petitioner has been recommended for appointment to the post of Male Constable (GD), the instant petition does not survive.

I have heard learned counsel for the respondent-State and have also perused the short reply filed by the respondent-State wherein there is a categoric stand that name of the petitioner has been recommended for appointment to the post of Male Constable (General Duty). In view of the reply filed by the respondent-State, the grievance of the petitioner stands addressed. Consequently, the instant petition stands disposed of.

(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE

April 07, 2022
Pankaj*

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No