

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

I.A.Nos. 3 & 5
Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Civil) No(s).22721/2005

(From the judgment and order dated 01/09/2005 in CWP No.14719/2004 of The
HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH)

HARYANA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA & ORS. Respondent(s)

(With appln(s) for impleadment/intervention and exemption from filing O.T
and office report)

Date: 24/09/2012 This Petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.K. PATNAIK
(IN CHAMBERS)

For Petitioner(s) Mr. Rajinder Mathur,Adv.

For Respondent(s) Ms. Aishwaya Bhati,Adv.
For Mr. Arvind Kumar Sharma,Adv.

Mr. Manjit Singh,AAG,
Mrs. Vivekta Singh,Adv.
Mr. Tarjit Singh,Adv.
Mr. Kamal Mohan Gupta ,Adv

Mr. Gaurav Teotia,Adv.
Mr. Satyendra Kumar ,Adv

Mr. Anil Kumar Mishra-I ,Adv

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

I.A.Nos. 3 & 5

These applications are for impleadment and intervention
filed by one Sushil Kumar in SLP(C) No. 22721/2005.

On a reading of the impugned order of the High Court, I find
that the High Court had only directed the Central Bureau of Investigation
to look into the entire process of selection and submit a report to the
Government within eight months for necessary action. The aforesaid
direction in the impugned order for investigation by the CBI has been
challenged by the Haryana Public Service Commission before this Court in
the special leave petition.

The fact that the name of the intervenor/applicant finds place
in the report of the CBI, is no ground to allow the application for
intervention. It is, therefore, not necessary to hear the
intervenor/applicant Sushil Kumar before passing any orders in the special
leave petition.

The applications are dismissed.

(KUSUM SYAL)
SR.P.A

(INDU SATIJA)
COURT MASTER

