

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

211

**CWP No.6279 of 2016
Date of decision:14.02.2023**

Dharambir

... Petitioner

Vs.

Haryana Staff Selection Commission

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL

Present:- Mr. Ashok Kaushik, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Saurabh Mohunta, DAG, Haryana.

SUVIR SEHGAL, J. (Oral)

Petitioner has approached this Court seeking issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondent to recommend his name for the advertised post of driver. Another prayer has been made for issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari quashing the selection of non-eligible candidates.

Vide advertisement No.1/2008 dated 07.02.2008 (Annexure P-1), respondent invited applications for 110 posts of driver (LTV) for various departments, Boards and Corporations. Petitioner applied for the post and was called for an interview on 30.06.2009. Petitioner's roll number did not figure in the final result declared on 23.04.2013 (Annexure P-4). After seeking some information under the Right to Information Act, 2005, petitioner has approached this Court.

Upon notice, writ petition has been contested by the respondent by filing a short reply.

Counsel for the petitioner submits that 05 marks for experience has not been awarded to the petitioner despite the fact that he had an experience of more than eight years.

State counsel, on the basis of the reply filed on behalf of the respondent submits that the petitioner has secured 34.35 marks in the selection process, out of which 27.35 marks were for the academic qualification and 07 marks were for viva-voce. He submits that the last selected candidate in the category of the petitioner had secured 40 marks. It is his submission that even if 05 marks for experience are granted to the petitioner, he will still not make the mark. He has specific instructions to state that all the 110 advertised posts have been filled.

In view of the stand taken by the respondent, no relief can be granted to the petitioner. Although the petitioner has sought the quashing of appointment of non-eligible candidates, but the petition is bereft of any details.

In view of the above, there is no merit in the petition, which is hereby dismissed.

February 14, 2023

savita

(SUVIR SEHGAL)

JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable	Yes