

236 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-12214-2021

Date of Decision:13.12.2023

MOHIT

..... Petitioner

Versus

DIRECTOR GENERAL, INDIAN COAST GUARD AND OTHERS

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present : None for the petitioner.

Mr. Anil Chawla, Advocate for the respondents.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)

1. On 09.07.2021, the following order was passed:

“It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has successfully participated in two stages of the selection process including the written test and the physical fitness. In all the stages, the photographs of the petitioner form part of the record. Therefore, there is no question of any fraud involved on the part of the petitioner in the selection process. However, at the third stage of the selection process, the candidature of the petitioner has been rejected from the selection process on the ground that his signatures do not match with the signatures made by him in the second stage of the selection process. It is further submitted that this difference has happened only because of an inadvertent mistake by the petitioner that he had signed in English in third stage, whereas, earlier in second stage, he had signed in Hindi. It is further submitted that in fact, this is not even a question of differing the signatures with the signatures at earlier stage, rather it is only a question of putting signatures by the petitioner in a different

language. However, this cannot be a ground for depriving the petitioner of an opportunity to participate in the competitive process and to avail opportunity of being selected.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Anil Chawla, Advocate, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents and seeks time to file written statement.

Adjourned to 14.09.2021.

In the meantime, the petitioner shall be permitted to participate in all the stages of the selection process. However, the same shall be subject to the decision of the present writ petition.”

2. The petitioner pursuant to aforesaid order was permitted to participate in the selection process.
3. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that petitioner could not cut the ice. The cut off point was 51 marks whereas petitioner could secure 44 marks, thus, his candidature was rejected.
4. In the wake of statement of learned counsel for the respondents, the present petition stands disposed of.
5. There is no representation on behalf of the petitioner, thus, petitioner is at liberty to move an appropriate application, if something survives.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)

JUDGE

13.12.2023

Ali

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No