
(2010) 10 P&H CK 0044
In the Punjab And Haryana At Chandigarh
Case No : Civil Writ Petition No. 5912 of 2010

Neelam Kumari and Others	Vs	APPELLANT
Haryana Staff Selection Commission		RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 08-10-2010

Acts Referred:

Citation : (2010) 10 P&H CK 0044

Hon'ble Judges : Ranjit Singh, J

Bench : Single Bench

Final Decision : Dismissed

Judgement

Ranjit Singh, J.—On 20.7.2006, certain posts were advertised in the Education Department for different categories. 816 posts so advertised were for Arts and Crafts Teacher and the closing date for receipt of the application was 21.8.2006. The said advertisement was challenged through writ petition No. 16214/2008 on the ground that age was reduced from 18 years to 17 years on the basis of an order passed by this Court. On 24.11.2008, a corrigendum was issued inviting fresh applications for determining the eligibility against the aforesaid advertisement. The candidates, who could not earlier make applications, were given fresh opportunity to make such application up to 10.12.2008. The candidates, who had already applied and their applications had been rejected on the aforesaid ground, were not required to make fresh applications and their earlier applications were considered valid. Rest of the terms and conditions as advertised on 21.8.2006, were kept as it is.

2. The Petitioners had already applied for the said posts. The Respondent had issued interview letters and roll numbers to Petitioner Nos. 1 to 3 for the purpose of conducting interview on 11.8.2008. Candidature of Petitioner No. 4 was rejected. The reference is made to some other writ petitions, where the challenge is made to the cut off date as having been provided as 10.12.2008 instead of earlier date which was 21.8.2006. Submission is that the Respondent has not changed the cut off date through the corrigendum as issued. The plea is

that eligible candidates have not been interviewed as per order passed in CWP No. 210 of 2009 and selection list has been declared. It is, accordingly, pleaded that the selection list would be null and void due to the violation of the orders passed by this Court.

3. In reply filed, the Respondents have mentioned that all the Petitioners were called for interview and have been assessed. None of them was able to make grade. The marks obtained by the Petitioners and that of the last selected candidate in their respective categories are disclosed showing that the Petitioners have scored much less marks than the last selected candidate in respective categories. Details in this regard have been reflected in the reply and are as under:

S. No.	Name/Roll No.	Cat.	Marks	Marks of last obtained selected candidate
1.	Neelam Kumari, R. No. 3659	Gen (female)	49.07	55.04
2.	Raj Rani, R. No. 2475	Gen -do- (female)	50.14	
3.	Rekha Rani, R. No. 970	-do-	47.52	-do-
4.	Neha Sharma, R. No. 4876	-do-	42.40	55.04
5.	Poonam Devi, R. No. 7601	-do-	47.39	-do-
6.	Hitesh Kumar, R. No. 4911	Gen.	45.85	56.35
7.	Susheel, R. No. 4303	Gen (female)	47.05	55.04
8.	Bhagwati, R. No. 4212	absent	-	-
9.	Brijesh, R. No. 8978	Gen.	43.51	56.35
10.	Zile Singh, R. No. 9108	Gen.	39.68	56.35
11.	Sapna, R. No. 7299	Absent	-	-
12.	Pooja Sharma, R. No. 10362	-	-	-
13.	Kavita, R. No. 9957	Absent	-	-
14.	Ankit Gupta, R. No. 10361	Gen.	43.87	56.35
15.	Mahesh Kumar, R. No. 3999	Gen.	49.83	-do-

16.	Sindhu,	R.	No.	327	BC-B(F)	49.15	53.00

17.	Reema,	R.	No.	3640	Gen (F)	47.85	55.04

4. Since the Petitioners have been considered and found not meritorious enough for being appointed, no occasion would arise to go into challenge made to the selection.

5. The present writ petition, therefore, deserves to be dismissed and it is so ordered.

6. At this stage, Counsel for the Petitioner seeks permission to withdraw the instant petition. This prayer is also declined.