

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

CWP-11989-2018 (O&M)

Date of decision: November 10, 2022

Amit Kumar

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

Present: Mr. Devender Arya, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Saurabh Mohunta, DAG Haryana.

ARUN MONGA, J. (ORAL)

Petition herein, *inter alia*, is for issuance of a writ in the nature of Certiorari for quashing result (Annexures P-4 & P-6) declared by respondent No.2 on 02.05.2018 & 05.05.2018, whereby candidature of the petitioner was not entertained for interview on the post of MPHWP (Male) against the Category No.07, in Advertisement No.01/2015 dated 19.06.2015 (Annexure P-1).

2. Similar controversy involved herein has already been adjudicated. Reference may be had to my earlier decision dated 05.09.2022 rendered in **CWP-11474-2018** titled **Baljeet Singh and others**, wherein it has been observed as under:

“4. *Apropos, learned State counsel submits that result of all the successful candidates, including unsuccessful petitioners before this Court, has been uploaded on the website. He has also tendered a comprehensive additional short reply dated 31.08.2022 on behalf of respondent No.3 in course of hearing, which is taken on record. Under instructions from Mr. Sandeep Manda, ADA and Mr. Jagdeep, Law Officer, Haryana Staff Selection Commission, he states that even if petitioners are held*

to be eligible for applying to the post in question, none of them have got more marks than the last selected candidates in the respective categories they have applied. Some of the learned counsel for the petitioners seriously controvert aforesaid statement of the learned state counsel. Per contra, they submit that despite having more marks than the last selected candidate in the category in which the petitioners had applied, they have not been given benefit thereof, ostensibly, on the ground of being ineligible.

5. *Being so, it is considered appropriate that those of the petitioners, who claim that they have got more marks than the last selected candidates in the categories they have applied, provided, it is so as per result uploaded on the website, they are at liberty to approach the respondent-Commission with individual representations. The Commission shall then pass speaking orders giving reasons as to why; (a). they have been held ineligible and; (b). whether or not they actually secured more marks as claimed by them.*

6. *Needful be done within a period of 60 days of the representation(s) being filed by those of the petitioners, who may choose to do so. ”*

3. Petition is disposed of in terms of **Baljeet Singh’s case (supra)**.

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

(ARUN MONGA)
JUDGE

November 10, 2022

mahavir

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No