

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA, CHANDIGARH**  
Sr. No.: 127

**Civil Writ Petition No.16859 of 2023**  
**Date of Decision: August 04, 2023**

Satish Kumar

..... PETITIONER(S)

*VERSUS*

State of Haryana & others

..... RESPONDENT(S)

**CORAM:**      **HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA**

...  
...

**PRESENT:** - Mr. Sukhjit Singh, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. R.K. Budhwar, Additional Advocate General,  
Haryana.

. . .

**Tribhuvan Dahiya, J (Oral)**

The writ petition has been filed seeking a writ of *mandamus* directing the respondents to appoint the petitioner in BCA/Handicapped (70%) category on the post of Art and Craft Teacher against advertisement No.6/2006, dated 20.07.2006.

2.            Learned counsel for petitioner contends that the petitioner is 70% handicapped, and no post for BCA/Handicapped category was advertised by the aforesaid advertisement infringing his rights. He, however, does not dispute that the petitioner applied for the post in question, i.e., Art and Craft Teacher, in response to the advertisement, took written test and was interviewed also, but could not make the mark and remained unsuccessful.

3.            Learned State counsel, appearing on advance notice, contends that earlier selection process pursuant to the advertisement in question was set aside by this Court, vide judgment dated 20.02.2015, directing the Commission to hold a fresh selection in accordance with law.

Appeal against the judgment was dismissed by the Division Bench vide judgment dated 10.11.2020, and SLP by the Supreme Court was also dismissed, vide order dated 14.12.2020. Thereafter, fresh selection process was carried out, and final result was notified on 10.03.2021. The petitioner remained unsuccessful and has no right to approach this Court by filing the instant petition at this stage.

4. The submissions made by learned counsel for the parties have been considered.

5. The petitioner has approached this Court against advertisement No.6/2006, in response where to he participated in the selection process. Remaining unsuccessful, he has filed the instant petition after delay of about seventeen years which cannot be entertained. Besides, the litigation concerning selection pursuant to the advertisement in question stands finally settled up to the Supreme Court.

6. In view thereof, there is ground to entertain this petition.

7. Dismissed.

**(Tribhuvan Dahiya)**  
**Judge**

**August 04, 2023**

avin

Whether Speaking/ Reasoned:  
Whether Reportable:

Yes/ No  
Yes/ No