

2025:PHHC:043388



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

151

CWP-9206-2025

Date of Decision: 01.04.2025

DEEPAK ARYA

... Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ.

Present: Mr. Ravinder Singh Dhull, Advocate
for the petitioner.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)

Prayer in the present petition is for directing respondent No.2/Commission to publish waiting list for the post of Group-D in compliance with the instructions dated 25.06.2019 (Annexure P-7) and dated 20.01.1988 (Annexure P-8).

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that respondent No.2-Commission published an Advertisement No.1 of 2023 dated 30.05.2023 for Group-C and Group-D posts. The last date for submission of application was 26.06.2023. The petitioner applied for both the posts in General Category. He, however, appeared in the written examination for Group-D post. The result was declared on 07.03.2024, but the petitioner did not fall in the selection zone. However, due to some errors, a revised result was published on 11.03.2024. Later on, respondent No.2-Commission declared an additional result vide notice

dated 10.08.2024. The petitioner had scored 75.71 marks in the written examination for Group-D post. It is further averred that since the result of Group-D post was declared prior to the result of Group-C post, many candidates joined Group-D post. However, later on, when they got selected for Group-C post, they resigned from the post of Group-D and joined the post of Group-C. Resultantly, more than 2000 advertised posts of Group-D remained vacant. It is further submitted that in case respondent No.2-Commission had declared the additional result or had prepared the waiting list to the extent of 10% of the posts as per rules, the petitioner would have secured the job. The petitioner made several representations, but all in vain. He further submits that as per instructions dated 20.01.1988 issued by respondent No.1-State, respondent No.2-Commission is duty bound to prepare waiting list up to 10% of the advertised posts, however, respondent No.2-Commission has not adhered to the said instructions and did not prepare the waiting list as per law.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Tapan Kumar, DAG, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the respondents and prays for some time to seek instructions.

Learned counsel for the petitioner, however, contends that he would be satisfied at this stage, in case respondent No.2- Commission is directed to treat the present petition as a representation and to consider and decide the same by passing a speaking order in a time bound manner.

Learned counsel for the respondents does not have any objection to the request made by learned counsel for the petitioner.

Accordingly, in view of the above; with the consent of the parties and without commenting anything on the merits of the case, the present petition

is disposed of while directing respondent No.2-Commission to treat the present writ petition as a representation and to consider and decide the same by passing a reasoned and speaking order after affording an opportunity of hearing to the respective parties within a period of two months of the receipt of certified copy of this order.

Petition stands disposed of accordingly.

APRIL 01, 2025.

Rajender

**(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No