



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

CWP-28194-2025

Date of Decision: 22.09.2025

DINESH SINGH YADAV

... PETITIONER

VS.

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

.. RESPONDENTS

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

Present: Mr. Mayank Yadav, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sourabh Mohunta, DAG, Haryana
for respondents No. 1 and 3.

Mr. Pankaj Middha, Addl. A.G.Haryana.
For respondent No.2.

ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA, J. (ORAL)

The short question that arises for our consideration in the facts of the case is as to whether the notification dated 11.06.2019, whereby recruitment was initiated against the posts in question by making provisions for the award of marks under the socio-economic criteria, is required to be interfered with in a petition filed in the year 2025, only because this Court has disapproved the award of marks under the socio-economic criteria.

2. It is not in dispute that the recruitment in question was initiated pursuant to an advertisement issued on 05.07.2019. The recruitment process concluded in the year 2021. No challenge was made by the petitioner at any stage, either to the advertisement or to the selection of the persons who had secured appointment pursuant thereto. It is only after the expiry of sufficient period that the writ petition has been filed, without impleading any of the selected candidates, seeking quashing of the advertisement as well as

consequential action on the ground that the socio-economic criteria was not a valid criteria for the award of any marks.

3. Learned State counsel opposes the petition on the ground that the same is grossly barred by laches.

4. We find substance in the objection raised by the respondents, inasmuch as there is no justification furnished in the writ petition for challenging the advertisement issued in the year 2019 by filing a writ in the year 2025. It is undisputed that the recruitment has already concluded, and persons have been appointed way back in the year 2021. Those selected persons have not been impleaded in the petition. In such circumstances, and after such long lapse of time, we are not persuaded to entertain the present petition merely on the ground that a Coordinate Bench has held the award of marks under the socio-economic criteria to be invalid.

5. The writ petition is devoid of merit and is accordingly dismissed.

6. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA)
JUDGE

(ROHIT KAPOOR)
JUDGE

22.09.2025

smriti

Whether speaking/reasoned	: Yes/No
Whether Reportable	: Yes/No