



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

119

CWP-19527-2024

Date of decision: 23.09.2024

LAKSHDEEP SINGH

...PETITIONER

Vs.

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present: Mr. Sanjeev Kumar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Aman Dhir, DAG, Punjab.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J (ORAL)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking direction to respondents to decide his representation dated 25.04.2024 (Annexure P-5).

2. The petitioner is relying upon judgment of this Court in **CWP-1005-2024** titled as “**Lovepreet Kumar and ors. Vs. State of Punjab and ors.**” **decided on 23.05.2024**. The petitioner has not assailed terms and conditions of the advertisement and as per advertisement, there was no waiting list.

3. Mr. Aman Dhir, DAG, Punjab submits that present case is different from ***Lovepreet Kumar*** (Supra). There was no waiting list in the advertisement in question because complicated permutations and combinations of candidates were involved, thus, no waiting list was prepared and this fact was clarified in the standing order. The judgment of this Court in ***Lovepreet Kumar*** (Supra) has been challenged by way of Intra Court Appeal and a Division Bench of this

Court has stayed operation of said judgment. The petitioner in any case has

secured 52 marks and cut off was 68.67. There are so many candidates in between petitioner and last selected candidate, thus, there is no possibility of selection of petitioner.

4. Mr. Sanjeev Kumar, Advocate expressed his inability to controvert aforesaid submissions of State Counsel.

5. This Court does not find any substance in the present petition. Thus, dismissed.

23.09.2024
manoj

[JAGMOHAN BANSAL]
JUDGE

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