



HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND AT NAINITAL

Writ Petition Service Single No. 2348 of 2026

09 September, 2026

Lokesh Kumar

--Petitioner

Versus

Uttarakhand Peyjal Sansadhan Vikas Evam Nirman

Nigam Head Office and Others

--Respondents

Presence:-

Mr. C.S. Rawat, learned counsel for petitioner.

Mr. Shailendra Singh Chauhan, learned counsel for respondent No.1.

Ms. Neeti Rana, learned counsel for respondent No.2.

Hon'ble Pankaj Purohit, J. (Oral)

A selection was held by the respondent No.2-Uttarakhand Technical Education Board, pursuant to advertisement issued on 04.05.2011 supplying the vacancies on the post of Junior Engineer (Civil) in different departments including Uttarakhand Peyjal Sansadhan Vikas Evam Nirman Nigam.

2. Petitioner participated in the said selection and he claims that his name was recommended for appointment under sports quota, though he applied under the reserved quota for SC candidates. Record speaks otherwise. He was called for document verification to provide the documents i.e. certificates/ educational certificates, claiming the benefit of horizontal reservation in his category, vide order dated 06.06.2012. Petitioner did not respond to the aforesaid letter for document verification and



consequently his name could not be selected and recommended.

3. Petitioner submits that since he did not claim any reservation under Sports quota as it is evident from application form submitted by him for the post of Junior Engineer (Civil), he did not respond to the aforesaid letter dated 06.06.2012. Consequently, petitioner was neither selected nor did he recommend for appointment.

4. Be that as it may, now, petitioner has come before this Court by filing this writ petition after a lapse of more than 15 years from the date of issuance of advertisement dated 04.05.2011, wherein, the selection process has been completed. However, petitioner has approached several authorities for seeking appointment, but that would not suffice the purpose. Petitioner should have approached this Court well within time. Since, petitioner has neither selected nor recommended for the appointment, no cause of action or right whatsoever accrued in his favour. Therefore, no interference is warranted.

5. Accordingly, the writ petition fails and the same is dismissed *in-limine*.

(Pankaj Purohit, J.)

09.09.2026

PN