



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

211

CWP-29600-2017 (O&M)
Date of decision: 17.03.2025

Anju

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State Bank of India and others

...Respondents

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

Present :- None for the petitioner(s).

Ms. Madhu Dayal, Advocate for respondent(s)-Bank.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The instant writ petition has been filed for seeking directions to the respondents to consider the petitioner for the post of Probationary Officer and impugning the action of the respondents alleging that despite the petitioner suffering from 100% visual disability, she was not given a writer at the time of dictation.

The written statement on behalf of the respondent(s)-Bank had been filed wherein apart from taking the preliminary objection with respect to the maintainability of the present petition on account of territorial jurisdiction, it was specifically averred that the petitioner was allowed the facility of a scribe but she could not clear the written examination.

Even though the written statement on behalf of the respondents had been filed in November-2018, however, no replication to the same has



been filed over a period of nearly 6 and a half years since then.

So much so there was no representation on behalf of the petitioner on the last date of hearing and prior thereto, the counsel for the petitioner had sought time. Even today, there is no representation on behalf of the petitioner. It seems that the petitioner is no more interested in pursuing the instant writ petition.

In view of the above, the instant petition is dismissed for non-prosecution.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

17.03.2025

Mangal Singh

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