



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

935

CWP-8191-2010 (O&M)
Date of decision: 03.10.2024

Parveen Kumar

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and Others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : None for the petitioner

Mr. Tapan Kumar, DAG Haryana

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer made in the present petition for seeking directions to respondents to consider the claim of the petitioner for appointment to the post of DPE.
2. Learned State counsel makes a reference to para 1 of the preliminary submissions, relevant extract whereof reads thus:

“The Respondent-Commission selected Ex-servicemen candidates against one post of ESM(BC-B) category and that no dependent of ESM/DFP was selected. Furthermore, the petitioner (Roll No. 3044) obtained 111 marks as against 121 marks of last selected candidate in BC-B category. Therefore, he even could not find place in BC-B category due to lesser marks than that of last selected candidate in this category. Hence, the petitioner has been considered in both the categories i.e. ESM(BC-B) and BC-B and in ESM(BC-B) category but he could not be selected due to availability of self-Ex-servicemen under ESM(BC-B) category and due to lesser marks of the last selected candidate in BC-B category. Therefore, it is wrong to say that he has not been considered in BC-B category and ESM (BC-B) category.”

3. In view of the above, the present petition is disposed of, reserving the petitioner with a liberty to get it revived, in case need arises.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

03.10.2024
M.Kamra

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes / No
Whether reportable	:	Yes / No