

Sr. No. 228

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH

CWP-12131-2018 (O&M)  
Date of decision: 12.12.2022

Sikander Singh

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA**

**Present:** Mr. Pawan Kumar, Advocate for  
Mr. Saurabh Arora, Advocate,  
For the petitioner.

Mr. R.K.S. Brar, Additional A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Vishnav Gandhi, DAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*\*

**ARUN MONGA, J. (ORAL)**

Petition herein, *inter alia*, is for issuance of a writ in the nature of Mandamus directing respondent No.2 to consider candidature of the petitioner for the post of Multi Purpose Health Workers (Male) for Health Services, Haryana against Advertisement No.1 of 2015, Category No.7, dated 19.06.2015 (Annexure P-1).

2. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

3. The controversy in hand has already been decided by me in CWP No.11474-2018 titled “***Baljeet Singh and others Vs. State of Haryana and others***”. For ready reference, relevant extract whereof is reproduced hereinbelow:-

“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.”*

4. In the premise, the instant writ petition stands disposed of in terms of CWP No.11474-2018 *ibid*.

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

**(ARUN MONGA)**  
**JUDGE**

**December 12, 2022**

Vandana

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No