



CWP-8496 of 2025 (O&M) 1

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

111

CWP-8496 of 2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision:24.04.2025

Gobind

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPINDER SINGH NALWA

Present: Mr. H. C. Arora, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajesh Sehgal, Addl. A.G., Punjab
for respondents No.1 and 2.

DEEPINDER SINGH NALWA, J. (Oral)

1. In the present petition, the petitioner has challenged the select lists dated 05.12.2024 and 15.01.2025 (Annexure P-10 and P-11 respectively) whereby, respondents No.3 and 4 have been selected on the post of Executive Officer Class-I against the posts reserved for Scheduled Caste (M&B) category.

2. The brief facts of the case are that the Department of Local Government, Punjab issued an advertisement dated 01.07.2015 inviting applications for various posts. As per the abovesaid advertisement, two posts of Executive Officer Class-I were reserved for Scheduled Caste (M&B) category. The petitioner belongs to Scheduled Caste (M&B) category. In

**CWP-8496 of 2025 (O&M) 2**

pursuant to the above advertisement, the petitioner applied for the post of Executive Officer Class-I. Written examination was held by the respondent department and the merit list was issued. As per the merit list issued by the respondent department, the petitioner had secured 48 marks whereas, respondent No.3 had secured 41 marks and respondent No.4 had secured 36.25 marks. However, no action was taken by the respondent department on the basis of the merit list for the purpose of appointments. The respondent department after 9 years issued a public notice dated 14.11.2024 (Annexure P-6) published in the newspaper inviting candidates for the purpose of verification of documents. Another public notice was issued on 27.11.2024 (Annexure P-8) for the purpose of verification of documents calling the candidates, who could not appear earlier for verification of documents. Yet another public notice dated 10.12.2024 (Annexure P-9) was issued by the respondent department for the purpose of verification of documents for the left over candidates. In spite of the fact that the respondents had issued three public notices, the petitioner did not appear before the respondent department for the purpose of verification of documents. The respondent department after carrying out the exercise of verification of documents of the eligible candidates, who had appeared before the committee, issued the select list dated 05.12.2024 and 15.01.2025 (Annexure P-10 and P-11 respectively) whereby, respondents No.3 and 4 were selected for the post of Executive Officer Class-I reserved for Scheduled Caste (M&B) category and the same was notified on the website of the respondent department.

**CWP-8496 of 2025 (O&M) 3**

3. As the petitioner did not appear on the scheduled dates for verification of documents and as such the case of the petitioner was not considered for the purpose of selection.

4. Aggrieved against the abovesaid action of the respondent department for not considering the case of the petitioner for the purpose of selection for the post of Executive Officer Class-I, the present writ petition has been filed by the petitioner.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that as the recruitment process was kept in abeyance by the respondent department for more than 9 years and as such, the petitioner lost contact with the respondents and as such could not appear on the scheduled dates for the purpose of verification of documents. He further submits that in fact the petitioner should have been informed through email or mobile as furnished by him in the application form, however as the respondents did not inform him on mobile or through email, therefore his case should be re-considered for the purpose of selection.

6. In support of his contentions, learned counsel for the petitioner relies upon the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in case of **State of Uttar Pradesh and others versus Pankaj Kumar 2022 (1) SCC 335.**

7. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and have perused the records available on the case file.

**CWP-8496 of 2025 (O&M) 4**

8. A perusal of the facts mentioned above would show that in fact the respondent department issued three public notices calling the candidates for the purpose of verification of documents. It is admitted fact that inspite of the various public notices published by the respondents for the purpose of verification of documents, the petitioner did not appear on the scheduled dates. The contention raised by learned counsel for the petitioner that in fact the petitioner should have been informed on mobile or email in regard to verification of his documents is concerned, the above said contention cannot be accepted for the reason that there was no condition mentioned in the advertisement or provided in the rules or instructions that a candidate had to be informed on mobile or email in regard to scheduled dates for verification of documents for the purpose of selection. Even otherwise also, it is not possible that every candidate had to be informed on mobile or email in regard to scheduled dates for verification of documents. The petitioner was required to appear before the committee on the scheduled dates as fixed for the purpose of verification of documents for the purpose of selection.

9. So far as the reliance made on the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in case **State of Uttar Pradesh and others versus Pankaj Kumar** 2022 (1) SCC 335 is concerned, a perusal of the facts of the abovesaid judgment would show that there were rules where, it was provided that a candidate had to be informed by postal communication or any other mode. As already stated above in the present case, there is no rule/instruction which mandates that the respondent department had to inform the candidate



CWP-8496 of 2025 (O&M) 5

on mobile or email in regard to scheduled dates fixed for the purpose of verification of documents. As the facts of *Pankaj Kumar's* case (supra) are different, the same does not help the case of the petitioner.

10. In view of the above, this Court does not find any merit in the present petition, the same is dismissed.

11. Pending application(s), if any, also stand(s) disposed of.

(DEEPINDER SINGH NALWA)
JUDGE

April 24, 2025
dinesh

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