

114.

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

CWP-18509-2022

Date of Decision: 23.08.2022

MONIKA

.... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present:- Mr. Lalit Mohan Barara, Advocate, for the petitioner.

JAISHREE THAKUR.J (Oral)

This is a petition that has been filed seeking to challenge the merit list prepared by respondent No.2 on the ground that petitioner has not been given due weightage under the socio-economic criteria as per clause (a)(i) of the advertisement dated 16.04.2018 (Annexure P-1), with a further prayer that the candidature of the petitioner for the post of Female Constable in General Category, be considered.

In brief, the facts are that the petitioner participated in the selection process under category No.2 for the post of Female Constable (General Duty). She cleared the written examination and was called for Physical Screening Test as well as scrutiny of documents, however, was not given appointment. It is submitted that the petitioner would be entitled to additional 5 marks on account of socio-economic criteria and in case said marks were given, she would have come to the zone of consideration.

Counsel for the petitioner would submit that by letter dated 08.04.2021, the petitioner had sought information as to how the marks under

the socio-economic criteria had been given to the selected candidates, however, that information has not been made available.

I have heard counsel for the petitioner and find that the instant writ petition would be barred by delay and laches. It is an admitted fact that the petitioner herein had applied under advertisement No.03/2018 issued on 16.04.2018 for appointment to the post of Female Constable and had participated in the selection process. The result was declared on 08.04.2019 and the petitioner had set back having accepted the result as was declared. In case the petitioner had grievance at that point of time, she should have taken the necessary steps to get her result modified. The plea taken that the information had been sought under RTI Act regarding the marks allotted to the selected candidates would be of no help to the petitioner herein since the very information sought is dated 08.04.2021 i.e. well after the result stood declared. Even otherwise, the information, as sought, would be of no help to the petitioner herein, who was agitating for additional marks of her own. It will be worthwhile to note that the selection process is over and joining has been effected. The persons who may or may not be lower in merit than the petitioner are also not a party to these proceedings. Consequently, finding that the claim of the petitioner is highly belated, the writ petition stands dismissed.

(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE

23.08.2022

sanjeev	Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
	Whether Reportable:	Yes/No