

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPS No. 2456 of 2016**

Smt. Seema Singh Thakur W/o Vijay Pratap Singh Thakur, Aged About 32 Years
R/o M I G / S 262 Kabir Nagar, Phase I, Near Adarsh Chowk, Tatibandha,
Raipur, Police Station Tatibandha, Civil & Revenue District Raipur
(Chhattisgarh).

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Higher Education Department,
Mantralaya Mahanadi Bhawan New Raipur, Police Station & Post New Raipur
Civil & Revenue District Raipur (Chhattisgarh).
2. Chhattisgarh Public Service Commission, Through Its Secretary, Shankar Nagar,
Raipur, Civil & Revenue District Raipur (Chhattisgarh).

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Kunal Das, Advocate
For Respondent-State	:	Mr. Chandresh Shrivastava, Panel Lawyer
For Respondent No.2	:	Mr. Y.C. Sharma, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Manindra Mohan Shrivastava, J.**Order on Board****28/09/2016**

Heard on admission.

1. The petitioner has challenged the action of the respondents whereby her candidature for appointment to the post of Assistant Professor has been rejected on the ground that the petitioner is not qualified.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in view of corrigendum issued on 17.10.2014, the petitioner was entitled to apply because the petitioner had appeared in the NET examination on 29.06.2014, result declared on 10.11.2014 and certificate issued on 25.02.2015. It is submitted that as the

petitioner was declared pass on a date which is earlier to 19.11.2014, her candidature was also liable to be considered.

3. A perusal of corrigendum dated 17.10.2014 shows that it was in view of the order passed by the Court that candidates who had otherwise obtained the eligibility prior to the original cut off date but could not apply, were granted one opportunity. Therefore, in order to be eligible, the petitioner ought to have obtained eligibility qualification on or before the original cut off date i.e. 09.10.2014.

4. On petitioner's own showing, the petitioner had obtained eligibility qualification after the aforesaid cut off date.

5. Therefore, no relief can be granted to the petitioner. The petition is accordingly dismissed.

Sd/-
(Manindra Mohan Shrivastava)
Judge