

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

(238)

CWP-17702-2020

Date of Decision : October 31, 2023

Sumit Dahiya

.. Petitioner

Versus

Haryana Staff Selection Commission

.. Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. Pardeep Sihmar, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Tapan Kumar Yadav, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI J. (ORAL)

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in the present writ petition, the petitioner has not been considered for appointment to the post of Excise Inspector on the ground that he never appeared for the scrutiny of the documents, which fact is incorrect.

2. Learned State counsel submits that the respondents are on oath to submit that the petitioner was given two chances to appear for the scrutiny of his documents and the petitioner remained absent in pursuance to the notices dated 08.08.2018 and 04.09.2018 hence, once the petitioner did not appear for the scrutiny of the documents and remained absent, which is clear from Annexure R-1/3, no grievance can be raised by the petitioner.

3. Faced with this situation, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that as disputed questions of fact have arisen in the present petition, the present petition may kindly be disposed of having been not pressed any further with liberty to the petitioner to avail appropriate remedy before the Civil Court to prove the factum that the petitioner was not given any notice for scrutiny of documents as being claimed by the respondents.

4. Ordered accordingly.

October 31, 2023

harsha

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No