

CWP-17521-2018

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

(102)

CWP-17521-2018

Date of decision : 18.04.2023

Varun Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL

Present:- None for the petitioner.

Mr. Pankaj Middha, Additional Advocate General, Haryana.

...

SUVIR SEHGAL, J. (Oral)

Instant petition has been filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India seeking issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to give an opportunity to the petitioner to appear for documents verification and interview for the post of Field Inspector (Store), advertised vide, Annexure P-3, as the petitioner has cleared the written test but could not appear on for document verification etc., as he had met with an accident. A direction has also been sought to the respondents to consider the representation dated 04.06.2018, Annexure P-7.

Once again, there is no representation on behalf of the petitioner.

On 29.03.2023, this Court passed the following order:-

“On 19.12.2022, this Court passed the following order:-

“Result of the petitioner has been brought in a sealed cover in the Court, which is opened and marked as Annexure

‘A’. Perusal of the same reveals that petitioner has secured aggregate of 169 marks. A copy of the same has been handed over to the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner, who seeks time to get instructions.

At her request, adjourned to 29.03.2023.

Replication, if any, be filed in the meanwhile.”

By referring to final result, State counsel submits that last candidate selected for the post of Field Inspector (Store) in the BCB category has scored 175 marks and the last candidate in the waiting list has got 172 marks. He submits that as the petitioner has failed to meet the cutoff, no purpose would be served in keeping the petition alive.

There is no representation on behalf of the petitioner.

List on 18.04.2023.

To be shown in the urgent cause list.

Counsel for the petitioner be notified of the date fixed.”

As per office note, counsel for the petitioner has been intimated, but there is no representation on behalf of the petitioner. It seems that the petitioner is not interested in pursuing the matter.

Dismissed for non-prosecution.

(SUVIR SEHGAL)
JUDGE

18.07.2023
Pardeep

Whether Speaking/Reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No