



CWP-5943-2001(O&M)

-1-

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

208

CWP-5943-2001(O&M)

Date of Decision: 28.11.2025

NARESH KUMAR

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present:- None for the petitioner.

Mr. Aakash Singla, Additional Advocate General, Haryana.

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J. (Oral)

The petition has been filed seeking a writ of *certiorari* quashing the order dated 27.03.2001, passed by the Commissioner and Secretary to Government of Haryana, Technical Education Department, Annexure P-6, rejecting the petitioner's representation seeking appointment against the post of Lecturer in Management under Scheduled Caste Block 'A' (SC-A) category. Further, a writ of *mandamus* has been sought directing the respondents to appoint the petitioner on the abovesaid post with effect from the date of appointment of the other candidates selected alongwith the petitioner against General category post.

2. As per facts apparent on record, the Haryana Public Service Commission advertised two posts of Lecturer in Management vide advertisement RG 13/97, Annexure P-1; one for General category and the other for SC-A category. The petitioner was recommended for appointment against the reserved category post but was not issued the letter of appointment on account of non-availability of posts. Against the General category post, two candidates, i.e., Sunil Kumar and Mahavir Sehrawat, were recommended



by the Commission. However, the second candidate/ Mahavir Sehrawat was also not given appointment and he approached this Court by filing CWP-310-2000 titled *Mahavir Sehrawat v. State of Haryana and others*, seeking quashing of the advertisement *qua* the post of Lecturer in Management reserved for SC-A category and also selection of the present petitioner (respondent no.4 therein) against the said post. The petition was dismissed by this Court vide order dated 09.05.2007, holding that only one post in the General category was available at the time of issuance of advertisement and there was no infirmity in denying him the appointment. It was also observed that after more than ten years of issuance of advertisement, the same was not liable to be quashed due to lapse of time.

3. It is apparent that the issue arising in the instant petition has already been considered and decided against the petitioner vide the aforementioned order dated 09.05.2007, passed in the connected petition.

4. In view thereof, the instant petition also stands dismissed.

5. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall also stand(s) disposed of.

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE

28.11.2025

Ad

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No