

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

223

CWP-8636-2016 (O&M)
Date of Decision :21.08.2024

Sukhpal Singh and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. Aminder Singh, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Swapan Shorey, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. M.S. Virk, Advocate for respondent No.2.

Mr. Jugansh Goyal, Advocate for
Mr. Denesh Goyal, Advocate for respondent No.4.

* * *

Harsimran Singh Sethi, J. (Oral)

In the present petition, grievance being raised by the petitioners is with regard to the selection made in pursuance to the advertisement Annexure P/1 issued by the respondents for the various posts including the post of Computer Operator. The petitioner competed for the said post of Computer Operator but could not get selected and the selection of the selected candidates is being challenged in the present petition.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that though, selection of three candidates namely, Amanjot Kaur, Jagtar Singh and Preeti Singla is being challenged in the present petition but as the respondents No. 5 and 6 namely Jagtar Singh and Preeti Singla have been appointed through

outsourcing agency, the present petition qua them may kindly be disposed of having been not pressed any further.

With regard to the appointment of respondent No.4 Amanjot Kaur, learned counsel for the petitioner argues that respondent No.4 was selected against the post of Computer Operator but it is the allegation of the petitioner that though, respondent No.4 has participated in the type test but she could not clear the same however, still she has been selected for the post in question.

Upon notice of motion, the respondents have filed reply, wherein, it has been stated that respondent No.4 participated in the selection process and also underwent type test and in para-11 of the reply, it has been mentioned that in the type test, two candidates namely, Anu Ahuja and Amanjot Kaur secured 39.35 and 35.60 marks out of 100 respectively whereas, the petitioners secured lesser marks.

Learned counsel for the respondents further submits that the selection has been made as per rules.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record with their able assistance.

Once, it has been categorically mentioned in the reply that respondent No.4 Amanjot Kaur has cleared the type test, this Court is not in the position to declare the said assertion as incorrect. Nothing has been brought on record to say that respondent No.4 failed to clear the type test, rather the assertion of the respondents shows that she has fairly secured passing marks in the type test.

Even otherwise, in case, the petitioner disputed the fact that respondent No.4 has cleared the type test, the said dispute cannot be decided

in a writ petition.

No other argument has been raised.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances recorded hereinbefore, no ground for interference by this Court is made out and the writ petition is accordingly dismissed.

Civil miscellaneous application pending , if any, is also disposed of.

August 21, 2024
aarti

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

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