

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-6421-2022
DECIDED ON: 23.11.2023

UTTAM SINGHPETITIONER

VERSUS

HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE
DEV. CORPORATION LTD. AND ANR.RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Sunil Kumar Nehra, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Jagbir Malik, Advocate for respondent No.1.

Mr. Akshaydeep Singh Balyan, Advocate for respondent No.2.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

At the very outset, Mr. Jagbir Malik, learned counsel for respondent No.1 submits that all the selected candidates have actually joined against the post and no vacant post is available as on date and at the same time, the stand taken in the reply on behalf of respondent No.2 to the effect that six candidates were called upon against the two vacant posts, which stand filled up and the petitioner does not fall within the zone of consideration on that account in the merit among the first six candidates.

In the light of above, learned counsel for the petitioner does not want to pursue the present petition.

However, the petitioner is at liberty to ask for the marks obtained by him and of the selected candidates in a comparative table.

Disposed of as having been rendered infructuous.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

23.11.2023

Poonam Negi

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No

Whether reportable Yes/No