



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

**CWP-16662-2025**

**Date of Decision: 29.05.2025**

**RAJ KUMAR AND ANOTHER**

..... Petitioners

*Versus*

**STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS**

..... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL**

Present : Mr. Manish Soni, Advocate  
for the petitioners.

Ms. Rajni Gupta, Addl. AG, Haryana.

\*\*\*\*

**JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)**

1. The petitioners through instant petition under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India are seeking direction to respondent to issue him appointment letter for the post of Shift Attendant.
2. The petitioners pursuant to advertisement No.3/2023 dated 20.03.2022 applied for the post of Shift Attendant. They are having requisite qualification i.e. Matric with ITI Electrician/Electronic /Wireman Trade, however, they have not secured 60% marks in ITI.
3. Mr. Manish Soni, Advocate, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this Court vide judgment dated 21.05.2025 passed in ***CWP-7612-2024*** titled as ***“Parmod Kumar and others vs. State of Haryana and others”*** has held that there is no requirement to secure 60% marks in ITI and case of petitioners is squarely covered by said judgment.
4. On being confronted with Paragraph No.18 of aforesaid



judgment, Mr. Manish Soni, Advocate submits that petitioners cannot be called as fence sitters because they have filed instant petition within few days from the date of passing said judgment.

5. The case of petitioners *prima facie* seems to be covered by afore-cited judgment, however, in the said judgment it has been categorically mentioned that benefit of the judgment would be available to those candidates who have approached this Court on or before the date of judgment. The said para for the ready reference is reproduced as below:-

*“18. This order may prompt fence sitters to file petitions before this court which would create chaos. To avoid further litigation, it is hereby made clear that the benefit of this judgment shall be available only to those candidates who have approached this Court on or before the date of this judgment.”*

6. In the wake of afore-cited categoric findings, the instant petition cannot be entertained.

7. Dismissed.

( JAGMOHAN BANSAL )  
JUDGE

29.05.2025  
*Ali*

|                           |        |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| Whether Reportable        | Yes/No |