

(2025) 12 P&H CK 0057

Punjab And Haryana HC

Case No: Civil Writ Petition No. 15462 Of 2017

Akshay

APPELLANT

Vs

Haryana Staff Selection
Commission, Panchkula

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision: Dec. 3, 2025

Acts Referred:

- Constitution Of India, 1950-Article 226, 227

Hon'ble Judges: Jagmohan Bansal, J

Bench: Single Bench

Advocate: Ravi Partap Singh

Final Decision: Dismissed

Judgement

Jagmohan Bansal, J

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking direction to respondent to allow him to participate in selection process and Interview-cum-Personality Test for the post of Constable under Advertisement No.08/2015 dated 19.07.2015 as last selected candidate under General Category has scored 54.90 Marks whereas petitioner had scored 59 Marks.

2. On 12.03.2020, the following order was passed:

"Pursuant to order dated 06.10.2017, learned State counsel submits that the video recording in the CD (compact) is available.

At the asking of the Court, Ms. Prerna Malhotra # 2236/Sector 19, Chandigarh, Phone No.9888555510, is directed to call the petitioner on an appointed date and identify the petitioner, in the video recording.

For this purpose, one responsible officer of the Commission be also associated.

Let the report in this regard be submitted within three weeks from today.

The petitioner is directed to deposit Rs. 11,000/- as fee for the officer, who would be appointed.

Adjourned to 27.04.2020.”

3. The aforesaid order was followed by order dated 24.05.2023:

“Learned State counsel submits that in pursuance of the order dated 12.03.2020, the petitioner was shown video recording of his physical standard test. The petitioner has wrongly assessed his performance on the basis of physical screening test. Infact, the petitioner has secured 10 marks on account of his physical screening test whereas he has allegedly claimed 15 marks under this Head. If 10 marks are added to the total tally of the petitioner, he would be getting 54.40 marks which is quite lower than the last candidate called for interview from the general category, who had secured 54.90 marks.

Since there is no representation on behalf of the petitioner, therefore, in the interest of justice, adjourned to 09.11.2023.”

4. There is no representation on behalf of the petitioner. It appears that with the efflux of time, petitioner has lost his interest to pursue the matter.

5. **Dismissed** with liberty to the petitioner to move an appropriate application within six months from today, if cause survives.