

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH.

Case No. : C. W. P. No. 16973 of 2014 (O&M)

Date of Decision : January 09, 2015

Sanjeev Kumar Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana and others Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SATISH KUMAR MITTAL.

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL.

* * *

To be referred to Reporters or not ?

Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ?

* * *

Present : Mr. Mayank Mathur, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ravi Dutt Sharma, DAG, Haryana.

* * *

SATISH KUMAR MITTAL, J. (Oral) :

C. M. No. 236 of 2015 :

The application is allowed and replication to the short reply dated 10.09.2014, filed by respondent no. 3 along with Annexure P-10 (Colly.), is taken on record.

Main Case :

The petitioner, who has passed two years' Diploma course in

Veterinary Livestock Development Assistant (VLDA) from the Institute of Advanced Studies in Education Deemed University, Gandhi Vidya Mandir, Sardarshahr (Rajasthan) (India), has filed the instant writ petition for issuing directions to the respondents to issue Roll Number and call him for interview for appointment to the post of Veterinary Livestock Development Assistant (VLDA), advertised by respondent no. 2 – Director, Animal Husbandry and Dairy Development, Haryana, Sector 2, Panchkula.

In the advertisement dated 08.07.2013, for appointment to the post of Veterinary Livestock Development Assistant (VLDA), it was the requirement that the candidate must possess the Diploma in Veterinary Science from a recognized Institute, approved by the Haryana Government, specified in Appendix – E.

As far as the petitioner is concerned, he has passed the aforesaid Diploma from the above mentioned Institute, which is not recognized by the Haryana Government.

Through the present writ, the petitioner seeks to persuade us to issue directions to the State of Haryana to consider him eligible as according to him, the Diploma possessed by him has wrongly not been recognized by the Haryana Government.

This plea of the petitioner is required to be considered only to be rejected. It is for the competent Authorities to judge so as to which qualification by an Institution or which Institution itself is to be recognized

or not. The Courts are not equipped to go into these issues, especially when there is no perversity or mala fide in State action complained of or shown. Even otherwise, the record reveals that the respondent – State had constituted a Committee to verify unrecognized/ unauthorized training Institutions and that Committee, in its report dated 20.09.1997 (annexed as Annexure R-1 to the written statement filed on behalf of respondents no. 1 and 2) had categorically observed therein that Diploma Certificates issued by the Institute of Advanced Studies in Education Deemed University, Gandhi Vidya Mandir, Sardarshahr (Rajasthan) (India) are sub-standard when compared with Chaudhary Charan Singh Agriculture University, Hisar. It has also been observed in the report that the Diploma in question was technical in nature and the Committee found that the Institute of Advanced Studies in Education Deemed University, Gandhi Vidya Mandir, Sardarshahr (Rajasthan) (India) did not even have basic facilities and infrastructure. Further, the Institute of Advanced Studies in Education Deemed University, Gandhi Vidya Mandir, Sardarshahr (Rajasthan) (India) was reported to be not even recognized by the Veterinary Council of India and that the said University was granting Diplomas through off campus centers located in Haryana, which were also not recognized by the Veterinary Council of India.

During the course of arguments, learned counsel for the respondents has pointed out that a Division Bench of this Court, in **C. W. P.**

No. 1640 of 2008 - Kartar Singh vs. Union of India and others

decided on 06.11.2012, has held that the Institute, from where the petitioner has passed his Diploma course, has even not complied with the directions given by the University Grants Commission (UGC) and thus, on this ground alone, the petitioner does not deserve relief.

It has further been pointed out that a similar relief has been declined by this Court in **C. W. P. No. 12458 of 2011 - Rohtash and others vs. State of Haryana and others**, decided on 05.08.2011.

In view of the above, we are not inclined to entertain this petition.

Dismissed.

(SATISH KUMAR MITTAL)
JUDGE

(DEEPAK SIBAL)
JUDGE

January 09, 2015

monika