

**In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh**

**214**

**CWP-26098-2013 (O & M)**

**Date of Decision: March 03, 2022**

**AMANDEEP SINGH**

**....PETITIONER**

**VERSUS**

**STATE OF PUNJAB & ANR**

**....RESPONDENT**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL**

Present: Mr.K.K. Saini, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. T.P.S. Chawla, DAG, Punjab.

Mr.Vikas Singh, Advocate for respondent No.2.

\*\*\*\*

**ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL, J (ORAL)**

Case taken up through video conferencing.

The petitioner is seeking a direction to the respondents to consider him for appointment to the post of Assistant Field Officer.

The petitioner is stated to have applied for the post of Assistant Field Officer in pursuance to the advertisement issued by respondent No.2 on 13.07.2012. This advertisement was for filling up the post of Assistant Field Officers and Field Officers. The examination could not be held and respondent No.2 issued another advertisement on 15.01.2013 for appointment as Field Officers. The petitioner applied for the post of Field Officer in pursuance to the advertisement dated 15.01.2013. The result was uploaded on the website by respondent No.2 on 13.09.2013 but the name of the petitioner was not in the merit list.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner had applied for both the post of Assistant Field Officer and the Field Officer and he should have been considered against both the posts. He had secured 55 per cent marks and, therefore, he should have been in the merit list for the post of Assistant Field Officer.

On the contrary, learned counsel for respondent No.2 while referring to the reply filed on its behalf submits that although the petitioner had applied for both the posts of Assistant Field Officer and Field Officer and had been issued admit cards for both the posts but he while taking the examination had submitted the admit card for the post of Field Officer and, therefore, he was considered for the post of Field Officer. The result was uploaded on the website on 13.09.2013 and along with the result, the candidates were given 06 days time till 19.09.2013 to submit their objections to the select list. Some of the candidates, who had not been considered for the post of Assistant Field Officer had submitted their objections and while considering their objections their candidatures were considered for the post of Assistant Field Officer. The petitioner did not submit any objection and, therefore, he could not be considered against the post of Assistant Field Officer. He further submits that all the posts have been filled up and the petitioner could not be accommodated at this stage without displacing the selected candidates, none of whom have been impleaded as a respondent in the instant petition.

Heard.

The petitioner had applied for both the posts but he had submitted the admit card only for the post of Field Officer and he was accordingly considered for this post. He was not found meritorious. The other candidates, who had filed objections, have been appointed to the post of Assistant Field Officer. The petitioner has not preferred any such objection even though period of 06 days was granted for this purpose. The selected candidates have not been impleaded by the petitioner and, therefore, at this stage, it would be difficult to grant the relief as prayed for.

Consequently, I do not find any merit in the instant petition which stands dismissed.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)  
JUDGE

March 03, 2022  
A.Kaundal

|                            |   |        |
|----------------------------|---|--------|
| Whether speaking/ reasoned | : | Yes/No |
| Whether Reportable         | : | Yes/No |