

repairs of the Bedford vehicles, for which the appointment was to be made and hence, Vijay Kumar was straightaway appointed as a Fitter Mechanic keeping in view the said fact and he was never promoted whereas the petitioner is claiming promotion by saying that Vijay Kumar is junior, which is incorrect.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the records of the present case with their able assistance.

5. Firstly, the claim being raised by the petitioner is on the ground that the petitioner is senior to one Vijay Kumar hence he is entitled for promotion to the post of Fitter Mechanic from the date when Vijay Kumar has been granted the said benefit. The petitioner is working as a Helper whereas, in the reply, it has already come on record that Vijay Kumar was directly appointed as Fitter Mechanic and was never promoted. That being so, the claim of the petitioner that Vijay Kumar has been promoted in preference to the petitioner though Vijay Kumar was junior, is incorrect and the same cannot be accepted as Vijay Kumar was appointed directly as Fitter Mechanic.

6. No other argument is raised.

7. Keeping in view the above, no ground is made out for any interference by this Court in the facts and circumstances of the present case.

8. Present petition is dismissed.

9. Pending application, if any, also stands disposed of.

17-03-2025
Sapna Goyal

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

NOTE: Whether speaking: YES
Whether reportable: NO