

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP No.2715 of 2017 (O&M)
Date of Decision:18.04.2022

Savita and another

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

..... Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS.JUSTICE LISA GILL

Present: None for petitioner no.1.

(Petition *qua* petitioner no.2 not pressed vide order dated
14.02.2017)

Dr. Kiran Pal Singh, AAG., Haryana.

LISA GILL, J(Oral).

Prayer in this writ petition is for issuance of a direction to the respondents to scrutinize the documents of petitioners, who had applied for appointment to the post of PGT Teachers pursuant to Advertisement No. 4/2015.

It is submitted that documents of petitioner no.1 were scrutinized on 17.02.2017. Petitioner no.2 chose to remain absent on 18.01.2017 i.e., the date fixed for scrutiny of her documents. However, it is mentioned in para no.3 of the said reply that the commission has decided that' *scrutiny of documents for various posts of PGTs and TGTs whose result has not been finalized, would be conducted again. All absentee candidates and candidates who have been treated ineligible on grounds*

decided in above mentioned writ petitions will be given a chance for scrutiny of documents. It is important to note that after the scrutiny of documents if a candidate is found eligible it will not confer any right of interview and candidates only falling within twice the number of vacancies shall be called for interview. However, those candidates who have already been found eligible and interviewed need not come for scrutiny of documents to be conducted again.'

Perusal of the file reveals that this writ petition was not pressed qua petitioner no.2 as is recorded in order dated 14.02.2017 and notice of motion was issued with a direction to the respondents to scrutinize the documents of petitioner no.1.

Learned counsel for the respondent-State while referring to the short reply filed on behalf of respondent no.2 submits that this writ petition is indeed rendered infructuous as documents of petitioner no.1 have since been scrutinized.

None has appeared on behalf of petitioner no.1, however, I do not find any justification for keeping the matter pending any longer in view of the circumstances as above.

Writ petition is accordingly disposed of as infructuous. Liberty is afforded to petitioner no.1 to file an appropriate application within four weeks, in case, any inaccurate fact has been set forth before this Court.

18.04.2022
s.khan

[LISA GILL]
Judge

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No.
Whether reportable : Yes/No.