

CWP-20877-2018 (O&M)

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

(101)

CWP-20877-2018 (O&M)

Date of decision : 19.05.2023

Dr. Rohit Kumar and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL

Present:- None for petitioners No.4 and 5.
(petition qua petitioners No.1 to 3 was
withdrawn vide order dated 28.09.2023.)

Mr. Pankaj Middha, Additional Advocate General, Haryana.

Mr. Kanwal Goyal, Advocate with
Mr. Shobhit Rapria, Advocate
for respondents. No.2 and 3.

...

SUVIR SEHGAL, J. (Oral)

1. Petitioners have approached this Court inter alia for issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing Advertisement No.2 dated 28.04.2014, Annexure P-1, qua the post of Veterinary Surgeon (HVS-II) and for setting aside the result of the final examination dated 03.08.2018, Annexure P-7.

2. Petition was dismissed as withdrawn qua petitioners No.1 to 3, vide order dated 28.09.2018.

3. Petitioners No.4 and 5 are applicants for the post of Veterinary Surgeon in general category. Primary grievance of the petitioners is that the essential qualification for the post has been wrongly prescribed.

CWP-20877-2018 (O&M)

-2-

4. While issuing notice of motion, this Court directed the respondents to provisionally interview the petitioners. Respondents No.4 did not appear in the interview. Vide order dated 28.09.2018 respondent No.5 was allowed to be interviewed provisionally and result was ordered to be kept in the sealed cover. Pursuant to order dated 26.04.2023 passed by this Court, result of the petitioner No. 5 as well as the cut off marks of all the categories have been produced in sealed covers, which were opened on the previous date of hearing. It was found that petitioner No.5 has scored 38.78 marks and he does not qualify for interview. Matter was adjourned to today to enable the counsel for petitioners No.4 and 5 to assist the Court.

5. Once again, there is no representation on behalf of petitioners No.4 and 5.

6. In view of above, this Court is of the opinion that keeping the petition pending, would not serve any purpose.

8. Petition is dismissed.

9. Xerox copy of the result is taken on record and original copy of the result is ordered to be returned to the counsel for respondents No.2 and 3.

(SUVIR SEHGAL)
JUDGE

19.05.2023

Pardeep

Whether Speaking/Reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable	Yes/No