



214-1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

LPA-1822-2018 (O&M)
in CWP-2525-2014
Date of Decision:07.05.2024

MEENA RANI

.....Appellant

V/s.**SUCHETA ARYA AND OTHERS**

.....Respondent

CORAM: **HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA**
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUDEEPTI SHARMA

Present Mr. Nikhil Lather, Advocate for
Mr. Anurag Goyal, Advocate, for the appellant.
(Respondent No.4 in CWP-2525-2014).

Mr. Vishal Sodhi, Advocate for respondent No.1.

Mr.Hitesh Pandit, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA, J. (Oral)

1. This Appeal has been filed by respondent No.4 in Writ Petition against order dated 23.10.2018 passed by learned Single Judge in CWP-2525-2014.

2. It is an admitted position that the appellant herein appeared before the Interview Board without original documents, where after, she has been selected by the Selection Committee. The selection record perused by the learned Single Judge reflects that there was no second chance given for interview to the appellant nor it records to examine the documents of the appellant at a later point of time.

3. As per Clause-13 of the advertisement dated 12.03.2013, the candidate was required to bring his or her original certificates at the time of interview, failing which, his or her interview was not to be conducted.

4. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that after some time, when appellant received her documents, she has informed the Selection



Committee about possessing all her original certificates and requested it to allow her appear in an interview, and on the basis of her performance before the Selection Committee, she was recommended for appointment by the Selection Committee. Learned counsel for the appellant also submits that the Selection Committee had supported the version of the appellant.

5. We find that the version of the appellant as well as the Selection Committee has been examined by the learned Single Judge, and the learned Single Bench has reached to a finding that bald statements made on affidavit are not supported by records. The record was also perused by the learned Single Judge. Thus, we are in agreement with the order passed by the learned Single Bench that a serious doubt has crept in the selection process and the appellant was appointed by adopting a method *alien* to the selection process.

6. Therefore, order dated 23.10.2018, passed by the learned Single Judge in CWP-2525-2014, is upheld and interim order granted by this Court vide order dated 26.11.2018 also stands vacated. Accordingly, the Appeal preferred by the appellant fails and stands **dismissed**.

7. No costs.

8. All pending applications filed in this case shall stand disposed of accordingly.

[SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA]
JUDGE

May 7, 2024
Ess Kay

[SUDEEPTI SHARMA]
JUDGE

Whether speaking / reasoned	:	Yes	/	No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes	/	No