

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

(218)

CWP-12284-2020

Date of Decision : November 24, 2022

Sudeepa Rani

.. Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.. Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Ms. Deepika, Advocate, for
Mr. R.D. Yadav, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Sandeep Singh Maan, Additional Advocate General,
Haryana.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI J. (ORAL)

Learned counsel for the respondents submits that the prayer of the petitioner is for considering the claim of the petitioner in respect of the Advertisement No.9/2015 dated 23.07.2015, a copy of which has been appended with this petition as Annexure P-1 whereas the petitioner never applied in pursuance to the said advertisement at all, hence, question of considering her claim under the said advertisement does not arise.

Learned counsel for the petitioner concede the factum that the petitioner never applied in pursuance to the advertisement as the petitioner consider herself as not eligible. That being so, no benefit can be granted to the petitioner for consideration in the absence of any application filled by

the petitioner. Learned counsel for the petitioner concedes the averments made in paragraph 4 of the writ petition.

Keeping in view the above, as the petitioner did not apply in pursuance to the advertisement, any corrigendum issued subsequent in the advertisement, will not give the claim to the petitioner to claim consideration under the main advertisement as there was no consideration sought in pursuance to the advertisement.

No ground is made out for interference by this Court in the facts and circumstances of this case.

Dismissed.

November 24, 2022

harsha

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No