



1013

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-12906-2010 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 29.08.2025

Ankush Kumar and Another

...Petitioners

Versus

Union Territory of Chandigarh and Others

...Respondents

And

Sr. No.	Case No.	Petitioner(s)	Respondent(s)
2.	CWP-10254-2010 (O&M)	Malkiat Singh	M.C. Chandigarh and Another
3.	CWP-10722-2010 (O&M)	Jagdeep Kumar and Others	M.C. Chandigarh and Another
4.	CWP-14972-2010 (O&M)	Gurvinder Singh	M.C. Chandigarh and Others

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. Ashok Tyagi, Advocate
for the petitioners in **CWP-12906-2010**.

Mr. Ranjivan Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Sandeep Kumar, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) in
CWP-10254-2010 and **CWP-10722-2010**.

Mr. Ranjivan Singh, Advocate,
Mr. Risham Raag Singh, Advocate and
Mr. Husandeep Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner in **CWP-14972-2010**.

Ms. Deepali Puri, Advocate
for respondent-M.C., Chandigarh.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. As common issues are involved in the captioned petitions,
with the consent of both sides, the same are hereby disposed of by this

common order. For the sake of brevity and convenience, facts are borrowed from **CWP-12906-2010**.

2. On 23.07.2010, the following order was passed:

“Petitioners applied for the post of Fireman in response to the advertisement dated 30.8.2009. Under the advertisement such of the candidates who qualify the physical standard test are required to be called for written test. The petitioners participated in the physical fitness standard test and were issued roll number for written test. It is stated that result of the written test has not been declared and the candidates have been called for interview. Petitioners have not been summoned for interview.

Notice of motion, returnable on 23.8.2010.

In the meantime, petitioners shall be provisionally interviewed. However, their result shall not be declared without the leave of the court. Such appearance shall not create any right or equity in favour of the petitioners and shall remain subject to outcome of the writ petition.

Copy of this order be given under the signatures of Court Secretary.”

3. The petitioners were not allowed to participate in the interview despite aforesaid order. The petitioners filed **COCP-1580-2010**. The respondent filed reply in the said COCP wherein it was deposed that copy of the order dated 23.07.2010 was received on 10.08.2010 whereas entire process completed on 05.08.2010.

4. Ms. Deepali Puri, Advocate submits that there were 32 posts under General Category. 79 candidates were called for interview. The respondent considered Physical Standard Test and Written Test and thereafter prepared merit list. The candidates, who appeared in merit list,

were called for interview. The petitioners did not figure in merit list, thus, they were not called for interview. The respondent acted fairly which is evident from the fact that candidates to the extent of 2.5 times of posts were called for interview.

5. The entire selection process completed in 2010 which was initiated in 2009. A period of 15 years has passed away. The selected candidates have already joined and are in service. There seems no reason to disturb appointment of already selected candidates.

6. In the wake of above discussion and findings, the instant petitions deserve to be dismissed and are accordingly dismissed.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

29.08.2025
Prince Chawla

Whether Speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable:	Yes/No