



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

118

LPA-308-2024 (O&M)

Date of decision: 04.09.2024

Preeti Singla**...Appellant****Versus****Haryana Staff Selection Commission and another****...Respondents**

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA**

Present: Mr. Parmod Sharma, Advocate
for the appellant.

Mr. Vivek Chauhan, Addl. A.G. Haryana.

DEEPAK SIBAL, J.(ORAL)

1. Through advertisement No.6/2006, the Haryana Staff Selection Commission (for short – the Commission) invited applications for appointment to several posts including 816 posts of Art and Crafts Teachers (for short – Teachers). After completing the selection process in the year 2010, the Commission made recommendations to the State to make appointments. At that stage, through CWP-18482-2010, the entire selection was challenged before this Court. Through judgment dated 20.02.2015 such petition was accepted by a learned Single Judge resulting in the quashing of the entire selection. The judgment of the learned Single Judge was challenged through an intra Court appeal being LPA-359-2015 which was



dismissed by a Co-ordinate Bench on 10.11.2020. The dismissal of the intra Court appeal was then questioned before the Supreme Court through SLP-14481-2020 which was also dismissed on 14.12.2020.

2. After the quashing of the entire selection, directions had been issued to the Commission to conduct fresh selection in a time bound manner. In compliance with these directions, the Commission published notice dated 28.12.2020 through which all candidates who had applied in pursuance to advertisement No.6/2006 were informed that a written test shall again be held on the dates specified in the publication. In response to the said publication, the appellant, along with other similarly placed candidates, sat in the written test and cleared the same. Thereafter, from 01.03.2021 to 04.03.2021 all candidates, who had cleared the written examination were required to come to the Commission for scrutiny of their original documents. Though most of the eligible candidates got their original documents scrutinized but the appellant did not. Thereafter, interviews took place from 14.03.2021 to 18.03.2021 in which too the appellant remained absent. Based on the final score of the candidates, the final result was then declared on 14.11.2021 and thereafter, on the recommendations made by the Commission appointments were made by the State to the posts in question.

3. In the meanwhile, the appellant petitioned this Court seeking issuance of directions to the Commission to recommend her case by condoning her absence at the time of scrutiny of documents and interview. Such petition of hers being CWP-6263-2021 – **Preeti Singla Vs. State of Haryana and others** was disposed of on 18.03.2021 with a direction to the State to consider the appellant's claim. In pursuance to the directions issued by this Court, the Commission passed an order dated 05.04.2021 rejecting the appellant's claim to permit her to take part in the selection process on the



ground that she had failed to respond to the notices issued by the Commission asking her to appear in the Commission for scrutiny of her documents as also for the reason that she had not taken part in the interview.

4. In November, 2023, the appellant challenged the order of the Commission dated 05.04.2021 which petition of hers has been dismissed on 20.12.2023 by a learned Single Judge of this Court. Such dismissal is the subject matter of challenge through the present intra Court appeal.

5. Learned counsel for the parties have been heard.

6. It remains undisputed that all candidates, like the appellant, who had cleared the written examination, had been duly informed by the Commission to appear in the Commission between 01.03.2021 and 04.03.2021 for scrutiny of their original documents and that the candidates whose documents were found to be in order were also subjected to interviews in the Commission which took place from 14.03.2021 till 18.03.2021. It is further the admitted position that neither the appellant got her documents scrutinized between 01.03.2021 and 04.03.2021 nor did she appear for interview which took place between 14.03.2021 and 18.03.2021.

7. For her non appearance in the Commission for scrutiny of her original documents and for not appearing for the interview only the appellant can be blamed.

8. Further, the speaking order passed by the Commission dated 05.04.2021 through which the appellant's claim had been rejected by the Commission had been challenged by her after an unexplained delay of over two and a half years and in the meanwhile, selections had not only been finalized but appointments had also been made to the posts in question.

9. In the light of the above, we find no reason to interfere with the impugned judgment.

- 10. Dismissed.
- 11. All pending miscellaneous application(s) shall also stand disposed of.

(DEEPAK SIBAL)
JUDGE

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

04.09.2024
sapna

Whether reasoned/speaking?	Yes/No
Whether reportable?	Yes/No