

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-1075-2023

Date of decision : 19.01.2023

Teena Wadhwa

..... Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab and others

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present: Mr. Jagtar Singh Sidhu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (Oral)

Respondent No.2 issued public notice bearing advertisement No.5/2021 inviting applications for recruitment of candidates of various posts in Department of Police including 214 vacant posts for the post of Information Technology Assistant (Software). The petitioner is also one of the applicants. The petitioner claims to have appeared in the written examination on 21.09.2021 and having successfully qualified the same.

2. The petitioner claims that respondent No.2 called the petitioner for verification of the documents on 06.04.2022. He appeared and submitted her documents. However, in the final result declared on 02.11.2022, the name of the petitioner did not figure. The petitioner represented to respondent No.3 by way of detailed representation which has been placed on record as Annexure P-10.

3. Counsel for the petitioner submits that in similar circumstances in case of *Harshpreet Singh Jeffey and others vs.*

State of Punjab and others, CWP No.27099 of 2022 decided on 05.12.2022, this Court has directed the respondent-authorities to look into the representation made by the candidates and Sub-Committee being in place to take up the grievance of the applicants, the petitioners stand relegated before the same. He thus relies upon order passed by this Court in *Harshpreet Singh Jeffey's* case (supra) wherein this Court held as under:-

“xx xx xx

This Court on 24.11.2022 had taken note of various contentions raised and was of the opinion that there seems to be apparent mistake in compiling the provisional merit lists and, therefore, asked respondent No.4 to be present in Court to explain whether or not the merit list needed to be relooked.

Pursuant to order dated 24.11.2022, Ms. Gurpreet Deo, Additional Director General of Police (Community Affairs), Punjab, who has headed the process of entire recruitment, is present in Court today. Mr. Gaurav Garg Dhuriwala, Senior DAG, Punjab, on instructions, would submit that there is no mistake in compiling the selection lists. In fact the selections have been made after taking into consideration the opinion of the Expert Committee that had been formulated to look into the experience certificates that had been furnished by the candidates. It is submitted that some of the candidates have furnished the experience certificates after having worked on computer in a karyana shop which would not be an adequate certificate for working in the Intelligence Wing as compared to the experience gainers with Infosys like companies. It is also submitted that

apart from the fact that certain candidates have filed various writ petitions, approximately 150 representations have been preferred by the candidates seeking a re-look into the selection list, which representations are being considered by a Sub Committee which has been constituted for this purpose. The Sub Committee is being headed by Mr. Rajesh Jaswal, IGP, who is also a member of the recruitment board and, therefore, the grievance of the petitioners would also be looked into and a speaking order will be passed thereon which would be communicated to the petitioners herein.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and in view of the fact that the entire matter is being re-looked into on the basis of representations that have already been preferred by the candidates and the Sub Committee constituted is to take up grievance of each applicant, let the writ petitions filed by the petitioners herein also be placed before the Sub Committee which would go into the issue and the grievance of the petitioners would also be considered and redressed by passing a speaking order, which order would be communicated to the candidates including the petitioners herein.

Consequently, these writ petitions are disposed of with the aforesaid directions.

Since there is urgency in the said matter and recruitment process ought to be completed, let the Committee complete the entire process within a period of six weeks from today.”

4. Counsel for the respondents submits that the present writ petition can be disposed off in the similar terms and the Sub-

Committee constituted to take up the grievance of the each applicant be directed to go into the issues raised by the petitioner in the writ petition and decide the claim of the petitioner by passing a speaking order.

5. Consequently, the present writ petition is disposed off with the directions that the case of the petitioner as projected in the present writ petition be re-looked by the Sub-Committee constituted to take up the grievance of the similarly placed applicants and be decided the same by passing a speaking order within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of the order. The order passed should be communicated to the petitioner.

6. Ordered accordingly.

(PANKAJ JAIN)
JUDGE

19.01.2023

Dinesh

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether Reportable : No