



CWP-11300-2024

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-11300-2024
Date of decision : 15.05.2024

Sunita Kumari

... Petitioner

Versus

Haryana Staff Selection Commission and another

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr.Vikas Sangwan, Advocate and
Ms. Monika Sangwan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms.Palika Monga, DAG, Haryana.

VIKAS BAHL, J.(ORAL)

1. This is a civil writ petition filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing the detailed scrutiny report (Annexure P-8) qua the petitioner with a further prayer directing respondent no.2 to grant 5 marks to the petitioner under socio economic criteria as per the conditions of advertisement (Annexure P-1) issued by the respondent.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioner, the petitioner had given a representation dated 15.02.2024 (Annexure P-12) and at this stage, would be satisfied in case the representation is considered by the competent authority of respondent no.1 in a time bound manner and if after considering the same,



CWP-11300-2024 2

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 no.1 would consider the said representation and decide the same within a period of three 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 no.1 to consider the representation dated 15.02.2024 (Annexure P-12) of the petitioner and decide the same, in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of three 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 three 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 no.1 would consider and decide the representation independently, in accordance with law.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

May 15, 2024.

Davinder Kumar

Whether speaking / reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No