

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

269

CWP-20868-2022**Decided on :15.04.2024**

Mohit Soni and others

... Petitioners

Versus

Haryana Staff Selection Commission

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL**PRESENT:** Mr. R. S. Dhull, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Naveen Singh Panwar, 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 of the impugned final result dated 16.06.2022 (Annexure P-12) to the extent of non-selection of the petitioners for the post of Male Constable (General Duty) (Category No. 1) as the petitioners have scored more than the last selected candidate in their category.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that for the grievance raised by the petitioners, the petitioners would give a representation to the competent authority of the respondent-Commission and at this stage, would be satisfied in case the said representation is considered by the competent authority of the respondent-Commission in a time bound manner and if after considering the same, in case, the plea raised by the petitioners is found to be meritorious, then necessary relief be granted to the petitioners.

3. Learned State counsel has submitted that the competent authority of the respondent-Commission would consider the said representation and decide the same within a period of three months from the date of the receipt of the said representation.
4. Keeping in view the above said facts and circumstances, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to the competent authority of the respondent-Commission to consider the representation which would be filed by the petitioners 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 said representation and in case, after considering the same, the plea of the petitioners is found to be meritorious, then necessary relief be granted to the petitioners and in case, the plea of the petitioners is 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 representation.
5. It is made clear that this Court has not opined on the merits of the case and the competent authority of the respondent-Commission would consider and decide the representation independently, in accordance with law.

15.04.2024
Mehak

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

<i>Whether reasoned/speaking?</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable?</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>