

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

**RSA No.1277 of 2014
Date of decision: 05.10.2015**

Rambir ... Appellant

Vs.

CCS, HAU, Hisar and anotherRespondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

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

Present:- Mr. S.P.Chahar, Advocate
for the appellant.

AMIT RAWAL J. (Oral)

Appellant-plaintiff is in Regular Second Appeal against the concurrent finding of facts and law, whereby, the suit seeking declaration that plaintiff is eligible and entitled to undergo the course of Veterinary and Livestock Development (VLD) Diploma (hereinafter referred to as VLDD), whereby, he was admitted and withdrawal of his admission is also null and void, for the reason, that he was performing the duties of Bull Attendant.

Mr. S.P.Chahar, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant submits that appellant was working as Bull Attendant but, he was given a designation of the same only on 06.04.2009 as pay scale of Chowkidar and Bull attendant are same. In pursuance to the prospectus issued for the academic year 2009-10 for admission

in VLDD, candidates, who, had been working on various other posts including Bull Attendant, were eligible. Since appellant was also discharging the duties of Bull Attendant, therefore, he was admitted in the aforementioned course. Thereafter, University vide notice dated 10.03.2010, erroneously called upon the appellant to show cause, as the appellant-plaintiff did not have 05 years experience. He further submits, that both the Courts below have not appreciated the aforesaid facts, thus, committed illegality and perversity in dismissing the suit.

I have heard learned counsel for the appellant and appraised the impugned judgments and decrees of the Courts below.

It is a matter of record that appellant-plaintiff was given the status of Bull Attendant w.e.f. 06.04.2009 and in the year 2010, he was not having experience of 05 years, which was essential requirement, as per the terms and conditions of the prospectus, therefore, candidature of the appellant was rightly withdrawn.

I do not find any illegality, much less, perversity in the impugned judgments and decrees of the Courts below. Both the Courts below have rendered the finding on the basis of the terms and conditions of the prospectus, which are sacrosanct between the candidates and the admission.

Keeping in view the aforementioned reasons, the present appeal does not involve substantial question of law to be determined being devoid of merit.

Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

October 05, 2015
savita