

115

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-22200-2023(O&M)

Date of Decision: 04.10.2023

Hardeep Singh

. . . . Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

. . . . Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA

Present: Mr. Aakash Singla, Advocate with
Ms. Vaishali Singla, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

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

SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA, J.(Oral)

1. Petitioner by way of this petition has prayed to set aside the select list dated 03.09.2023 issued by respondent no.2/Director Public Instructions, whereby 260 campus managers have been appointed in the Government schools in the State of Punjab.
2. Learned counsel submits that respondent no.3 had issued an advertisement inviting applications for recruitment on the post of campus manager through outsourcing agency. As per the advertisement, candidates who are retired from government services from minimum 3rd grade (C-category) State Government, Central Government, local bodies or equivalent were eligible to apply for the job. The petitioner too had participated after applying and was also called for interview, but in the final select list prepared, the petitioner's name did not find place.
3. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that the persons who were holding lower post of group C category have been included in the

select list while the petitioner who had retired from group B post had been left out. It is further stated that as per the advertisement, 150 posts of campus manager were to be filled but a list of 260 candidates had been published. Thus, the advertisement and the selection process are wrongful.

- 4. I have considered the submissions.
- 5. The selection process has been conducted by respondent no.3 i.e. Punjab Ex-Servicemen Corporation (PESCO) which is established under the Punjab Ex-Servicemen Corporation Act, 1978 for conducting selections. The post which has been advertised is for appointing through outsourcing agency and retired persons have been held to be eligible for the said post.
- 6. The petitioner having participated in the selection process and failed to make a place in the select list cannot turn around and challenge the said selection process. Having failed, he has no locus to turn around and challenge the number of selections which have been done. Even if the number of posts had been increased which are outsourced, selection could have been from the applicants, but even in the increased number of posts, the petitioner has failed to qualify.
- 7. In view thereof, the petitioner is estopped.
- 8. Writ petition fails and is accordingly *dismissed*.
- 9. All pending applications also stand disposed of accordingly.

(SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA)
JUDGE

October 04, 2023

Mohit goyal

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