



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-10480-2024
Date of decision : 07.05.2024

Pritam Kumar ... Petitioner

Versus

Haryana Staff Selection Commission ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Ravinder Singh Dhull, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms.Rajni Gupta, Addl.A.G. Haryana.

VIKAS BAHL, J.(ORAL)

1. This is a civil writ petition filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India for the issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari quashing the impugned final result dated 29.02.2024 (Annexure P-4) vide which the name of the petitioner has not been recommended in the General Waiting List of the post of Male Constable (General Duty) in the Haryana Police (category no.1) by non-granting 5 marks of the socio-economic criteria. A further prayer for the issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus has been made to direct the respondent-Commission to grant 5 marks to the petitioner under the socio-economic criteria.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioner, the petitioner had given a representation (Annexure P-15) and at this stage, would be satisfied in case the said representation is considered by the competent authority of respondent-Commission in a time bound manner and if after considering the same, in



case, the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious, then necessary relief be granted to the petitioner.

3. Learned State counsel has submitted that the competent authority of respondent-Commission would consider the said representation and decide the same within a period of two months from the date of the receipt of certified copy of the present order.

4. Keeping in view the above said facts and circumstances, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to the competent authority of respondent-Commission to consider the representation (Annexure P-15) of the petitioner and decide the same, in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of two months from the date of the receipt of certified copy of the present order and in case, after considering the same, the pleas of the petitioner are found to be meritorious, then necessary relief be granted to the petitioner and in case, the pleas of the petitioner are not found to be meritorious, then a speaking order rejecting the same be passed within a period of two months from the date of the receipt of certified copy of the present order.

5. It is made clear that this Court has not opined on the merits of the case and the competent authority of respondent-Commission would consider and decide the representation independently, in accordance with law.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

May 07, 2024
Davinder Kumar

Whether speaking / reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No