

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

(104)

CWP-5498-2018

Date of decision : 22.03.2023

Sandeep Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...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 inter alia seeking issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari for setting aside public notice, Annexure P-12, whereby, the list of the candidates, who have qualified for the post of Sanitary Inspector of Urban Local Bodies, Haryana, have been called for interview.

Petitioner was an applicant for the post of Sanitary Inspector, which was advertised vide No.07/2017, Category 19, dated 16.02.2018, in the Scheduled Caste category. As per result produced by the respondents before this Court, petitioner secured 112 marks in the written examination, whereby, the last candidate, who was called for interview, had secured 116 marks in the written examination. Pursuant to order passed by this Court on 06.03.2018, petitioner was provisionally interviewed. The final result, after interview, was produced and taken on record vide order dated 30.11.2022,

which is reproduced as under:-

“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 121 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 his request, adjourned to 02.02.2023.

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

State counsel submits that the last candidate selected on the post of Sanitary Inspector in the Scheduled Caste Category has secured 134 marks, whereas the last candidate selected on the said post in the BCA category has got 128 marks after 30.11.2022.

Counsel for the petitioner has been seeking adjournments.

There is no representation on behalf of the petitioner. It seems that the petitioner is not interested in pursuing the petition.

In any case, no fruitful purpose would be served in keeping the petition pending.

Petition is dismissed.

(SUVIR SEHGAL)
JUDGE

22.03.2023
Pardeep

Whether Speaking/Reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable	Yes/No