

2025:PHHC:104970



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

202

CWP-16836-2015 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 12.08.2025.

SANDEEP

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA AND OTHERS

... Respondent(s)

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

PRESENT: Mr. S.S. Duhan, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Hitesh Kumar Sammi, Central Govt. Counsel,
for respondents No.1 and 2.

None for respondent No.3.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J (ORAL)

Prayer made in the instant writ petition is for directing the respondents to issue the appointment letter to the petitioner on the post of Constable (General Duty) with all the consequential service benefits.

2 Learned counsel for the petitioner has vehemently argued that the respondents had issued an advertisement for

2025:PHHC:104970



recruitment to the post of Constable (General Duty) in Border Security Force, CISF, CRPF in the year 2010 for a total number of 49898 posts. The petitioner being eligible applied for the same to the Deputy Director (NWR), Staff Selection Commission, and was issued Roll No.1601011880 under the General Category. The petitioner participated in the selection process and secured an appointment. He contends that the petitioner was not given appointment at the initial stage since he was declared as unfit in the first medical examination. However, in the Review Medical Board, the petitioner was declared fit and a certificate was issued on 22.05.2013 in this regard. It is contended that under the similar circumstances, the respondents gave appointment to one Krishan Kumar bearing Roll No.2201102572, who belonged to General Category, and had equal marks, while ignoring that the appointment also had to be given to the petitioner. His right of appointment has thus been declined for the said reason.

3 A written statement was filed on behalf of the respondents No.1 and 2 wherein a preliminary submission has been made that as per the advertisement, in the event of tie between two candidates, preference was to be given to the person who had secured more marks in Part A of the examination. Since said Krishan Kumar had secured 24 marks in Part A of the written examination as compared to 21 marks secured by the petitioner, hence, he was offered appointment, in terms of the applicable rules.

2025:PHHC:104970



4 No counter to the same has been filed by the petitioner. Hence, the said specific stand and the provision relied upon by respondents No.1 and 2 has remained uncontroverted and unrebutted.

5 A short reply has also been filed on behalf of respondent No.3.

6 At this stage, even though counsel for the petitioner contends that various other persons, who were lower in merit have been offered appointment, however, he does not dispute that no specific instance of any person having been offered appointment despite being lower in the merit has been stated in the petition or brought on record by way of additional affidavit.

7 Hence, the aforesaid argument that has been advanced by the counsel for the petitioner which is general, omnibus, vague and without any supporting corroborative evidence or document cannot be accepted.

8 Consequently, the instant writ petition is found to be lacking in merits and the same is accordingly dismissed.

August 12, 2025.	(VINOD S. BHAR DWAJ)
raj arora	JUDGE
<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	: Yes/No
<i>Whether reportable</i>	: Yes/No