



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

141

CWP-16571-2026

Date of Decision: 25.05.2026

AJAY

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Sanchit Punia, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Saurabh Girdhar, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Prince Singh, Advocate, for respondent No.4.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The present civil writ petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India seeking issuance of a writ of *mandamus* directing the respondents to exhaust the prescribed zone of consideration up to two times of advertised posts as per sub-Clause (viii) of Clause 13 of Advertisement dated 25.09.2025 (Annexure P-1) in view of availability of vacant posts and consequently, consider and appoint the petitioner to the post of Assistant Engineer (Civil Cadre), being fully eligible and meritorious.

2 Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that respondents issued advertisement dated 25.09.2025 (Annexure P-1) for recruitment of 19 posts of Assistant Engineer (Civil Cadre) on the basis of GATE scores. Petitioner, being fully eligible, submitted his application on 21.10.2025 (Annexure P-2). As per sub-Clause (viii) of Clause 13 of the



advertisement, candidates numbering two times the advertised posts are required to be shortlisted for document verification in order of merit. Respondents published a list (Annexure P-4) of two times shortlisted candidates for provisional document verification. Petitioner applied under RTI Act as to how many candidates appeared for scrutiny of documents and also inspected the record and found that candidates equal to two times the advertised posts had not appeared for document verification. It is further submitted that the final recommendations for appointment were made and the validity of the waiting list is prescribed as one year. Consequently, upon the failure of the selected candidates to join service in terms of the recommendations, the respondents are legally obligated to operate the waiting list and offer appointment to the next eligible candidates in order of merit. The petitioner served a legal notice dated 18.03.2026 (Annexure P-8), but no response has been received till date.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he would be satisfied if the legal notice dated 18.03.2026 (Annexure P-8) of the petitioner is decided by respondent No.4 by passing a speaking order in a time bound manner.

4. In view of the limited prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner, respondent No.4 is directed to consider the legal notice dated 18.03.2026 (Annexure P-8) of the petitioner and pass a speaking order, after affording him an opportunity to be heard, within a period of 03 months from the date of receiving a certified copy of this order. Further, the decision taken thereof shall be conveyed to the petitioner. Needless to say, if the petitioner is found entitled to the relief sought, the same shall be granted to



him forthwith by the respondent.

5. Disposed of, accordingly.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

May 25, 2026
Nisha-1

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