

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

**129**

**CWP-24620-2022 (O & M)**

**Date of Decision: October 27, 2022**

**PANKAJ**

**....PETITIONER**

**VERSUS**

**STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS**

**....RESPONDENTS**

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

Present: Mr.K. S. Malik, Advocate for the petitioner.

\*\*\*\*

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

The petitioner has challenged the selection of respondent No.3 on the post of Junior Store Keeper. He also sought a direction to appoint him as a Junior Store Keeper.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that although the petitioner had the requisite experience, he was not given any marks for experience. The petitioner has secured 15 marks while respondent No.3, who is the selected candidate, had secured 17.5 marks. He also submits that the petitioner had better academic record but has been granted only 01 mark in skill assessment against 07 marks granted to respondent No.3.

Heard.

The petitioner has impugned the appointment of respondent No.3 in pursuance to the advertisement No.PR-42 of 2018 after almost 04 years.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner could not prefer the petition earlier due to Covid-19 pandemic and, therefore, there is no delay in preferring this petition.

The petition has been preferred in the year 2022 after over 04 years of the selection process having been completed. The allegation that the petitioner has been granted less marks as compared to respondent No.3 for skill assessment, has not been substantiated by any material on record. It is not for this Court to assess as to how many marks a candidate is to be granted. There is no objective material placed before this Court to indicate that respondent No.3 had been granted more marks or petitioner had been granted less marks arbitrarily. The petitioner has not been granted any marks for experience although he is claiming 02 marks for experience on the basis of experience certificate (Annexure P-4). Even if the petitioner is granted 02 marks for experience, he would still fall short of the marks obtained by respondent No.3. The petitioner has obtained 15 marks while respondent No.3 has obtained 17.5 marks.

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

**(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)**  
**JUDGE**

**October 27, 2022**  
**A.Kaundal**

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