



LPA-1394-2025

-1-

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

128

LPA-1394-2025

Date of decision : 09.09.2025

Gobind

... Appellant

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.. Respondents

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA**

Present:- Mr. H.C. Arora, Advocate for the appellant.

Mr. Aftab Singh Khara, Senior DAG, Punjab.

Anupinder Singh Grewal, J. (Oral)

1. The appellant has challenged the judgment passed by the Single Bench on 24.04.2025 whereby the writ petition preferred by the appellant seeking his appointment as Executive Officer Class-I has been dismissed.

2. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the appellant had secured 48 marks which was more than the marks obtained by private respondents No.3 & 4, therefore, he ought to have been offered appointment. The result had been declared after 09 years of the examination and therefore, the appellant ought to have been informed personally about the verification of documents either by notice, e-mail etc. but no intimation was sent to the appellant.

3. Heard.

**LPA-1394-2025****-2-**

4. The appellant is stated to have participated in the selection process for the post of Executive Officer Class-I in pursuance to the advertisement dated 01.07.2015 (Annexure P-1). The appellant and the private respondents had applied against the Scheduled Caste (M&B) category. The appellant had secured 48 marks while the private respondents No.3 & 4 had secured 41 and 36.25 marks respectively. The examination had been conducted in the year 2015. The respondents had issued a public notice on 14.11.2024 (Annexure P-6) inviting the successful candidates for verification of documents. Two other notices were issued on 27.11.2024 and 10.12.2024 (Annexures P-8 & P-9 respectively), but the appellant did not appear before the respondents for verification of documents. The respondents after scrutinizing the documents of the eligible candidates had prepared the selection list and private respondents No.3 & 4 were selected. We do not find any merit in the contention of the counsel for the appellant that the appellant ought to have been served a notice individually for the reason that the public notice had been issued on 03 occasions. The petitioner ought to have been vigilant and appeared before the respondents for verification of documents and the consequent appointment. There is no requirement for issuing notice through mobile message or e-mail.

5. In response to a query of this Court as to whether any post is vacant against which the appellant could be accommodated, learned State counsel submits that all the posts have been filled up and there is no vacant post.

**LPA-1394-2025****-3-**

6. In view of the aforementioned facts and circumstances, we do not find any manifest illegality in the judgment of the Single Bench dismissing the writ petition. Consequently, the appeal stands dismissed.

**(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE**

**(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE**

September 09, 2025
sonia gugnani

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