

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(103)

CWP-6945-2024

Date of decision: - 22.03.2024

Surekha

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present:- Ms. Nevadita Malik Sharma, Advocate,
and Mr. Abhinay Sharma, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Rajni Gupta, Additional Advocate General, Haryana.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. Present writ petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of an appropriate writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing the selection and appointment of respondent No.5 to the post of Female Constable (HAP-Durga-I) against Advertisement No.04/2020 dated 30.12.2020 Category No.3.

2. On earlier occasion also, a writ petition was filed on the same cause of action, in which, this Court was pleased to pass the following order: -

1. *This is a petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for the issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing the selection and appointment of respondent No.5 to the post of Female Constable (HAP-DURGA-1) against Advt. No.04/2020 dated 30.12.2020, Category No.3.*

2. *Learned counsel appearing for respondent No.5 has*

submitted that till date, respondent No.5 has not been given appointment, thus, the prayer made in the writ petition for setting aside the selection and appointment of respondent No.5 to the post of Female Constable is premature.

3. Learned State counsel has submitted that the petitioner has been given appointment and thus, the present writ petition has been rendered infructuous.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner seeks to withdraw the present writ petition with liberty to file a fresh petition in case respondent No.5 is appointed and in case any cause is survived.

5. In view of the above statement of learned counsel for the petitioner, the present writ petition is dismissed as withdrawn with the aforesaid liberty.

6. It is made clear that in case any such petition is filed by the petitioner, the same would be considered independently, in accordance with law.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, in view of the above, seeks to withdraw the present writ petition with liberty to the petitioner to institute appropriate proceedings in accordance with law.

4. Dismissed as withdrawn, with the aforesaid liberty.

March 22, 2024
naresh.k

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

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