

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

228

CWP-3433-2019
Decided on : 04.10.2023

Bijender

. . . Petitioner

Versus

Haryana Staff Selection Commission

. . . Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

PRESENT: Mr. Shalender Mohan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Harish Rathee, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J. (ORAL)

1. In the present petition, the grievance of the petitioner is qua the non selection of the petitioner in pursuance to the advertisement No. 4/2018 by which, Group-D posts were advertised.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has secured 60 marks, however, the candidate with 59 marks have been put in the waiting list. Hence, the respondents were under obligation to grant the petitioner the benefit of selection/appointment against the Group-D post.

2. The respondents in the reply have mentioned that after the selection process was concluded, it was found that the last selected candidate against the post in question had secured 60 marks whereas, the petitioner had secured 59 marks and the petitioner could not be put

in the waiting list also even though, the petitioner had secured equivalent marks to the last selected candidate in the waiting list i.e. 59 as the petitioner was younger in age, hence, he could not make to the waiting list as well.

- 3. There is no replication filed to the written statement.
- 4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record with their able assistance.
- 5. Once, it has already come on record that the last selected candidate had secured more marks than the petitioner and though, the petitioner secured equivalent marks with that of the candidate put in the waiting list but as the waiting list is also made keeping in view the number of posts advertised, the petitioner could not make to the waiting list being younger in age. Hence, keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, no prejudice has been caused to the petitioner qua the selection made.
- 6. No ground for interference by this Court is called for.
- 7. Dismissed.
- 8. Any civil miscellaneous application, pending if any, stands disposed of.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

04.10.2023
Mehak

Whether reasoned/speaking?	Yes/No
Whether reportable?	Yes/No