



140

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

LPA-1274-2026 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 4th May, 2026.

DR. VIJENDER SINGH

.....Appellant(s)

V/s

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

.....Respondent(s)

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

Present Ms. Himani Makkad, Advocate,
 Mr. Himalya Makkad, Advocate
 for the appellant.

Mr. Pankaj Middha, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA, J. (Oral)

1. This appeal assails the judgment of the learned Single Judge dated 11.02.2026 whereby the appellant's claim for appointment to the post of Lecturer/PGT (Sanskrit), pursuant to advertisement issued in the year 2008, has been rejected.

2. The facts have been noticed by the learned Single Bench in Paragraphs No.1 to 3 of the impugned judgement, which are as under:-

“2. Learned counsel contended that the petitioner applied for both the posts of Lecturer/PGT and TGT Sanskrit in response to the aforementioned recruitment notice under Blind and Low Vision category. He was selected and appointed as TGT/Sanskrit Teacher vide office order dated 24.08.2009, Annexure P-5, and another candidate, Satbir Sharma, was selected and appointed as Lecturer/PGT Sanskrit under the category

vide order dated 18.08.2009, Annexure P-4. The latter's appointment was challenged by filing a writ petition, however, the Commission on its own cancelled his appointment on 15.06.2015, as he was not possessing the minimum degree of permanent disability, i.e., forty per cent in Blind and Low Vision category, as per instructions dated 01.01.1999. Thereafter, the petitioner was called for document verification in order to consider him for the post of Lecturer/PGT vide memo dated 15.06.2015, Annexure P-8. In the meanwhile, the Commission had issued another advertisement of 2013 inviting applications for the post of PGT Sanskrit. The petitioner applied for it under the same category and was selected also; he joined service on 06.08.2014. Later, he was appointed as HCS (Haryana Civil Services) officer in the year 2024. Learned counsel further contended that it was due to wrong selection of Satbir Sharma against the post of Lecturer/PGT Sanskrit that the petitioner was refused appointment. Accordingly, he has a right to be appointed from that date/18.08.2009, and also the consequential service benefits."

3. The Learned Single Bench, having notice the aforesaid facts, has dismissed the Writ Petition *in limine*, by observing as under:-

"3. Considering the submissions, this Court is not inclined to entertain the petition since Satbir Sharma had been appointed as Lecturer/PGT Sanskrit against recruitment notice dated 13.09.2008. Although his appointment was cancelled by the Commission on 15.06.2015, and the petitioner was called for document verification to consider his claim against the post, but he

did not go; instead, opted for a fresh appointment as PGT Sanskrit pursuant to another advertisement of 2013, and joined service as such. He is now working on a still higher post of HCS officer and cannot be allowed to turn around to claim benefits of an appointment that he had willingly forgone. He never got appointed as Lecturer/PGT Sanskrit. Thus, the claim is illusionary, apart from being belated, and cannot be entertained.”

4. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that after the appointment of one Satbir Sharma was cancelled by the respondent-Haryana Staff Selection Commission on 15.06.2015, the appellant did appear for document verification and the contrary observation, recorded in Para 3 of the judgement of the learned Single Bench, is factually incorrect.

5. Our attention has not been invited to any assertion in the Writ Petition that the appellant did appear for the document verification after he was called for the purpose consequent upon cancellation of appointment of one Satbir Sharma on 15.06.2015. Even if the oral submission of the appellant is taken to be correct, yet, we would not be justified in entertaining such claim of the appellant inasmuch as the cause of action to the appellant, in that situation, had arisen in the year 2015 itself. Filing of the Writ Petition in the year 2026 is otherwise is barred by unexplained laches. Thus, in either eventuality, the claim of the appellant has rightly been non-suited by the learned Single Bench.

6. In that view of the matter, the Appeal fails and is **dismissed**, accordingly.

7. All pending applications, if any, in this case are disposed of accordingly.

[ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA]
UDGE

[ROHIT KAPOOR]
JUDGE

May 4, 2026
Ess Kay

<i>Whether speaking / reasoned</i>	:	<i>Yes</i>	/	<i>No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	:	<i>Yes</i>	/	<i>No</i>