



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

LPA-2401-2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 04.11.2025

SURAJ AND ANOTHER

....APPELLANTS

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

....RESPONDENTS

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ROHIT KAPOOR**

Present: Mr. A. S. Rawaley, Advocate
for the appellants.

Mr. Pankaj Middha, Addl. AG, Haryana.

ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA, J. (ORAL)

1. Learned Single Judge has dismissed the writ petition filed by the appellants wherein the challenge was laid to the decision of the respondent(s) to withdraw 15 advertisements issued earlier by the Haryana Staff Selection Commission (for short, 'the *Commission*').

2. As per the impugned decision, after withdrawal of the Advertisement(s), fresh Common Eligibility Test-01/2025 would be conducted and thereafter, the post would be re-advertised.

3. The learned Single Judge has observed that it is the prerogative of the respondents either to advertise the post or to withdraw the advertisement. No right accrues in favour of a candidate merely by submitting an application for consideration of appointment.

4. Pursuant to the orders passed in the previous occasion, an affidavit has been filed stating that a conscious decision was taken to withdraw the advertisements and now fresh advertisements would be issued after declaration of result of CET-01. It is, therefore, the case of the respondents that no prejudice has been caused to the appellants.

5. Learned counsel for the appellants submits that in the previously initiated process, and now withdrawn, candidates four times the number of posts were to be called for the test while in the substituted policy, which would now been implemented, 10 persons would be invited against each post.

6. Merely because more number of persons would be invited against each post can hardly be a ground for this Court to interfere in the matter inasmuch as the right of the employer to withdraw the advertisement(s) is not restricted in any manner. It is, otherwise, well-settled that even a selected candidate gets no indefeasible right to the post. {See:-***Shankarsan Dass v. Union of India, 1991 (3) SCC 47***}.

7. In the facts of the case, we find that the State has already conducted CET-01 Examination in July, 2025 and after declaration of its result, the respondents intend to re-advertise the posts. The argument that the rule of the game cannot be changed would not apply to the facts of the present case, inasmuch as the earlier game has been abandoned, and the commencement of a fresh game would not amount to a change in circumstances.

8. Accordingly, the present appeal fails and is accordingly dismissed.

9. Pending application(s), if any, also stand(s) disposed of.

[ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA]
JUDGE

[ROHIT KAPOOR]
JUDGE

NOVEMBER 04, 2025
Rahul Joshi

- | | |
|------------------------------|--------|
| 1. Whether Speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| 2. Whether Reportable | Yes/No |