

**204 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CWP-16881-2013 (O&M)

Date of decision: 11.01.2023

Shaveta

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present: Mr. S.P.S.Tinna, Advocate for the petitioner
Mr. Charanpreet Singh, AAG, Punjab
Mr. K.L.Singla, Advocate for respondent no.4

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J (Oral)

The petitioner prays for the issuance of a writ in the nature of Mandamus to direct the respondents to appoint her on the post of English Lecturer.

Admittedly, the recruitment notice was issued on 23.09.2009. On an opportunity being given, the petitioner did not attend the counselling held on 07.07.2011. All the candidates were informed about the counselling through a public notice. Moreover, a Division Bench of this Court while dealing with the same recruitment in **LPA-1781-2014** titled as '**Loveleen Kaur vs. The State of Punjab and others**' decided on 03.11.2014, has held as under:-

“We find that the appellant cannot claim any direction for further counseling having failed to appear for the counseling on 7.7.2011. In response to a public notice, many candidates, including some of juniors to the appellant, have appeared for counseling. Once the appellant has failed to appear on a specific date, no grievance can be entertained so as to direct the respondent to hold another

counseling. Learned Single Judge has rightly declined to interfere in the order passed by the respondents declining the representation of the petitioner.

Another argument raised by learned counsel for the appellant is that if in future it is decided to hold counseling again, the appellant should be called for counseling.

We do not find that any such direction can be given. The publication to conduct counseling was done through a public notice. The second counseling was conducted in the year 2011 i.e. more than 3 years earlier. The selection process once concluded, cannot be kept pending till eternity so as to confer right on the applicants for appointment. However, as and when any fresh advertisement seeking appointment is issued, it shall be open to the appellant to apply in accordance with law.

We do not find any merit in the appeal and the same is hereby dismissed.”

In view of the aforesaid, no ground to issue the writ, as prayed for, is made out.

Hence, dismissed.

All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, are also disposed of.

11.01.2023

rekha

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE