

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

235

CWP-14389-2022
Decided on :27.02.2024

Sachin Sehrawat

. . . Petitioner

Versus

Haryana Staff Selection Commission

. . . Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

PRESENT: Mr. R. S. Dhull, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Naveen Singh Panwar, DAG, Haryana.

VIKAS BAHL, J.(ORAL)

1. Present Civil Writ Petition has been filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari quashing the impugned final result dated 16.06.2022 (Annexure P-4) to the extent of non-selection of the petitioner for the post of Male Constable (General Duty) (Category No. 1). Further prayer has been made for directing the respondent to grant 4 additional marks as per weightage for his graduation and other prayers have also been made in the present petition.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioner in the present writ petition, the petitioner would give a detailed representation to the competent authority of the respondent- Haryana Staff Selection Commission and at this stage, he would be satisfied, in case, the said representation is considered by the competent authority of the respondent in a time bound manner and in case, the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious then to grant necessary relief, in accordance with law.

3. Learned State Counsel has submitted that in case, any such representation is moved by the petitioner then the competent authority of the respondent would consider the said representation and decide the same, in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of two months from the date of receipt of the said representation.

4. Keeping in view the abovesaid facts and circumstances, the present Civil Writ Petition is disposed of with direction to the competent authority of the respondent to consider the abovesaid representation as and when filed by 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 receipt of the said representation and in case, the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious then the competent authority of the respondent would grant necessary relief in accordance with law and in case, the competent authority of the respondent is of the opinion that the pleas raised by the petitioner are not meritorious then a speaking order rejecting the same be passed within a period of two months from the date of receipt of the abovesaid representation.

5. This Court has not opined on the merits of the case and the competent authority of the respondent would consider and decide the case of the petitioner independently, in accordance with law.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

27.02.2024
Mehak

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