

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

**C.W.P. No.20714 of 2010 (O&M)
Date of Decision : 11.05.2015**

Mahipal and another

..... Petitioners

Versus

Chaudhary Devi Lal University, Sirsa and others

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present : Mr. Abhishek Yadav, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Anurag Goyal, Advocate
respondent No.1.

Mr. Abhishek Sethi, Advocate
for respondents No.2 to 4.

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

AJAY TEWARI, J. (Oral)

By this petition the petitioner has challenged the selection of respondents No.2 to 4 as Restorer.

As regards respondent No.2, the ground taken is that the school from where he has obtained the experience certificate is a fictitious institution. Learned counsel for the respondents No.2 to 4 has annexed document (Annexure R-1) which is a reply given in response to RTI

application wherein New M.D. High School, Hansi has been shown as recognized.

As regard respondent No.3, the allegation is that he had not supplied the experience certificate on the last date mentioned in the advertisement but had supplied it on the date of the interview. In this connection, learned counsel for the respondents No.2 to 4 has pointed out that respondent No.3 had given the experience certificate but in that experience certificate the salary had not been mentioned and the respondent No.1-University wrote a letter not only to him but to all candidates who had some discrepancies in their documents and asked them to complete those discrepancies. In the case of respondent No.3 he was asked to bring the experience certificate after mentioning the salary drawn and it was this experience certificate which was again re-submitted on the date of interview.

As regards respondent No.4, it was stated that the experience certificate (Annexure P-7) which was submitted by that respondent did not meet the requirement. In reply, the respondent No.1 has annexed a photocopy of the experience certificate submitted by the respondent No.4 and learned counsel for the respondent No.1 has pointed out that there are material discrepancies in the document (Annexure P-7) and the certificates actually submitted by the respondent No.4. He has further argued that the certificates actually submitted by respondent No.4 fulfil all the requirements and the document (Annexure P-7) seems to be fabricated.

No replication has been filed to these submissions. No other

argument has been raised by learned counsel for the petitioner. In the circumstances, no fault can be found with the selection of respondents No.2 to 4.

Petition is dismissed.

Since the main case has been decided, the pending civil miscellaneous application, if any, also stands disposed of.

May 11, 2015

ashish

**(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE**