

113

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-19194-2023 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 11.10.2023

Sukhdeep Singh

. . . . Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

. . . . Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA

Present: Mr. HPS Ishar, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Paramjit Batta, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA, J.(Oral)

1. The petitioner admittedly applied for the post of Forest Guard under the advertisement which was issued by the respondents. However, he did not turn up for the selection. It is submitted that the petitioner had no information or intimation from the respondents with regard to the selection process, and he was therefore wrongfully deprived of from participating in the selection process.
2. The petitioner has set up his case based on the information received under the RTI Act, and further submits that mere posting the information on the website is not sufficient for giving information to the concerned applicant relating to the selection process, and the respondents should have sent an e-mail to the petitioner for informing about the date of selection in examination.
3. Learned counsel further states that a procedure should be laid down for future selections so that persons like the petitioner may not be deprived of in future also.

- 4. I have considered the submissions.
- 5. This Court finds that the selection process was conducted transparently.

Although the petitioner missed the bus by not regularly checking the website of the respondents. All other candidates who have participated in the selection process were also informed in the similar fashion, and therefore it cannot be said that the respondents have acted in a pick and choose manner or their action is, in any manner, arbitrary. Having failed to participate in the selection process, the petitioner cannot be allowed to challenge the method and manner in which the selection was conducted. The issue for laying down criteria for method of selection is not for this Court to examine in the present case.
- 6. Writ Petition is misconceived and is accordingly *dismissed*.
- 7. All pending applications also stand disposed of.

(SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA)
JUDGE

October 11, 2023
Mohit goyal

- | | |
|-------------------------------|--------|
| 1. Whether speaking/reasoned? | Yes/No |
| 2. Whether reportable? | Yes/No |