

N THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

101

RA-353-CW-2023 in  
CWP-32481-2019  
Date of Decision :-14.11.2023

Saurabh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. Rahul Deswal, Advocate for the review-petitioner.

\* \* \*

**Harsimran Singh Sethi, J. (Oral)**

1. In the present review petition, review through a different counsel is being sought qua the order 26.07.2023 passed by this Court in the main writ petition.

2. Before proceeding further, order dated 26.07.2023 passed by this Court is reproduced as under:-

*“Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that as the petitioner was the only candidate, who qualified in the written test but still was not appointed on the ground that the diploma in question is not obtained from a recognized institute, hence, the present petition may kindly be treated as not pressed any further with liberty to file a fresh writ petition in case, the petitioner is aggrieved as and when the same post is advertised again, by keeping the question of law open. Ordered accordingly.*

3. On being asked as to whether the order has been passed by this

Court or the writ petition has been disposed of on the statement of the

counsel, who had appeared on behalf of the petitioner, learned counsel for the review-applicant submits that the writ petition has been disposed of on the statement of the learned counsel, who had appeared on behalf of the petitioner.

4. Keeping in view the said fact that order has not been passed by this Court rather the petition has been disposed of on the asking of the learned counsel, who had appeared on behalf of the petitioner, question of reviewing the said order does not arise.

5. Even otherwise, learned counsel for the review-petitioner has sought to project that the claim of the petitioner is covered under the Instructions dated 18.03.1975.

6. On being asked as to whether diploma which has been done by the petitioner is from Government institution, learned counsel for the review-petitioner conceded the fact that the said diploma has been done by the petitioner from a private institute. Further, learned counsel for the review-petitioner has not been able to prove that the diploma obtained by the petitioner is either approved by the Government of Haryana or Government of Delhi.

7. Under these circumstances, even the argument, which has been raised by the learned counsel for the review-applicant that his case is covered by the instructions dated 18.03.1975 is factually incorrect.

8. No other argument is raised.

9. It has become a trend to file review petition through a different counsel after being unsuccessful in a first round of litigation, which practice needs to be curbed so as to save Court time. Though, this Court was of the

view to impose a cost upon the review-applicant, but keeping in view the fact that the petitioner is unemployed, present review petition is dismissed without any cost.

November 14, 2023  
aarti

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)  
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No  
Whether reportable : Yes/No