

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

217

**CWP-13253-2017 (O&M)
Date of decision: 09.03.2023**

Sumitra and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. Vishal Garg Narwana, Advocate and
Mr. Sagar Sharma, Advocate for the petitioners.

Ms. Tanushree Gupta, DAG Haryana.

Mr. K.K. Gupta, Advocate for respondent No.3.
(Board of School Education, Haryana)

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

Prayer in the present petition is for issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari quashing the impugned order dated 27.04.2017 (Annexure P-7) to the extent that 'those candidates about whom a clear finding of impersonation has been received from State Crime Records Bureau (SCRB)/Forensic Science Laboratory (FSL), their candidature will be cancelled and they will not be offered appointment' as the same has been recorded at the back of the petitioners and quashing the list (Annexure P-8) whereby the claim of the petitioners for appointment to the post of Primary Teacher in terms of advertisement No.02/2012 dated 08.11.2012 (Annexure P-3) has been rejected with a remark of 'Not Eligible' against the Roll Number/Merit Number of the petitioners, without assigning any reason and without affording any opportunity of hearing.

At the outset, learned State counsel submits that as per the

communication/letter dated 09.03.2023 of the Director Elementary Education, Haryana, wherein it is specifically mentioned that all the petitioners have already been given appointments, except petitioner No.2-Suman Rani and petitioner No.4-Sumitra, as their thumb impressions were found to be mismatched.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and have also gone through the case file.

Since as per the report of SCRB, the thumb impressions of petitioner No.2-Suman Rani and petitioner No.4-Sumitra were found to be mismatched, this Court does not find any ground to interfere in the present case.

In view of the above, the present petition is disposed of.

However, if petitioner Nos. 2 and 4 are aggrieved by the communication/letter dated 09.03.2023 and report of SCRB, they may challenge the same, if so advised.

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)

JUDGE

09.03.2023

Mangal Singh

Whether reasoned/speaking?

Yes/No

Whether reportable?

Yes/No