

Sangeet Majhotra Vs State of Punjab and Others

Court: High Court Of Punjab And Haryana At Chandigarh

Date of Decision: May 20, 2014

Hon'ble Judges: Sabina, J

Bench: Single Bench

Advocate: M.L. Singla, Advocate for the Appellant

Final Decision: Dismissed

Judgement

Sabina, J.

Petitioner has filed this petition seeking a direction to the respondents to call him for counseling for recruitment of computer

faculty.

2. Case of the petitioner, in brief, is that the Punjab Information and Communication Technology Education Society had advertised 700 posts.

Petitioner applied for the said post of computer faculty and took the written examination on 18.03.2012. Petitioner secured 22.5 marks out of

100. Counseling was held from 04.09.2012 to 06.09.2012 with regard to candidates of category of the petitioner who had secured marks from

46.75 to 38.75. However, petitioner was not called for counseling purpose. So far as other categories are concerned, candidates were called who

had secured marks up to 20.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner was a meritorious candidate and was liable to be called for counseling. So far

as the other categories were concerned, candidates had been called for counseling who had obtained marks upto 20, whereas, for Scheduled

Caste (R & O) category, candidates had been called for counseling who had obtained marks from 46.75 to 38.75.

4. In the present case, a perusal of Annexure P-4 reveals that candidates in Scheduled Caste (R & O) category had been called for counseling

purposes who had secured 46.75 to 38.75 marks. In fact, for every category, persons obtaining different set of marks had been called for

counseling. It is not the case of the petitioner that a person who had got lesser marks than the petitioner had been called for counseling. Keeping in

view of the number of posts, the cut-off marks at the time of counseling must have been fixed by the respondents. Respondents cannot be

compelled to call the petitioner for counseling who had obtained 22.5 out of 100 marks whereas, the cut off marks with regard to the Scheduled

Cast category had been kept from 46.75 to 38.75 marks. Counseling was held in September 2012, whereas, the petitioner has approached this

Court after a long delay.

5. Hence, no ground for interference is made out.

6. Dismissed.