



CWP-25354-2025

-1-

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

112

CWP-25354-2025

Date of Decision: 12.09.2025

Vikas Kumar

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

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

Ms. Tanushree Gupta, Senior Deputy Advocate General,
Haryana**TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J. (Oral)**

The petition has been filed *inter alia* seeking a writ of *certiorari* quashing the letter dated 12.05.2025 and order dated 15.07.2025, Annexures P-13 and P-14 respectively, whereby the recommendation to appoint the petitioner on the post of TGT Physical Education has been cancelled.

2. Learned counsel contended that the petitioner was selected for the post of TGT Physical Education as per result dated 27.07.2024, Annexure P-4, whereby the candidates selected were advised to report for joining as soon as they received an intimation regarding it from the nodal authority of their allocated department. No such intimation was received by the petitioner, and he accordingly approached the department vide letter dated 07.11.2024, Annexure P-10, seeking permission to join. The request was, however, rejected vide impugned communication dated 12.05.2025, Annexure P-13, on the ground that despite opportunity having been granted to appear for document verification on 28.07.2024, 29.07.2024, 12.08.2024 and 12.09.2024, he did not appear, and



therefore, his case could not be considered. It is further contended that there are only two members in the family, the petitioner himself and his aged mother, who was seriously ill during July to September 2024, as established by the medical records, Annexures P-7 to P-9. Besides, the posts are still vacant and the petitioner can be considered for appointment. It is due to *bona fide* reasons that he could not respond to the notices issued by the Department.

3. Learned State counsel submits that pursuant to the selection, the petitioner was required to appear for document verification in the concerned Department, and for that purpose the aforementioned four opportunities were issued to the candidates. The petitioner did not appear, nor did he submit any document explaining his inability to do so. Therefore, the Department had no option but to cancel the recommendation, which was rightly done vide impugned order dated 15.07.2025. The same procedure was followed in case of all other candidates also who could not appear for document verification pursuant to the opportunities aforementioned.

4. Submissions made by learned counsel for the parties have been considered.

5. There is no dispute that despite having been called to appear for document verification at least four times, the petitioner failed to do so. Not only that, he did not submit any representation pleading any relevant cause for his non-appearance or seeking another opportunity for the purpose. The first representation in this regard was made on 07.11.2024; it was on the ground of his mother being unwell. However, it was much after the document verification had concluded, and cannot be termed *bona fide*. Therefore, in case the representation was not considered a valid ground by the Department to afford

**CWP-25354-2025****-3-**

another opportunity, no exception can be taken to it. There is no violation of any rule or regulation on the part of the Department in doing so.

6. In view thereof, there is no ground to entertain the petition, and it stands dismissed.

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE

12.09.2025*Payal*

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No