

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

**CWP No. 17868 of 2012
Date of Decision:- 29.11.2016**

Rubby RaniPetitioner

vs.

State of Punjab and anotherRespondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE DAYA CHAUDHARY

Present:- Mr. R.V.S. Chugh, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Harkesh Manuja, Addl.A.G., Punjab.

Mr. Gagandeep Singh, Advocate,
for respondent No.2.

DAYA CHAUDHARY, J. (Oral)

The grievance of the petitioner in the present petition is that an advertisement was issued in the year 2009 for filling up the vacancies of Computer Teacher in the State of Punjab. The written test was conducted on 29.3.2009. Petitioner being eligible applied for the said post as he has passed Post Graduation Diploma in Computer Applications and Master of Science (IT) from Punjab Technical University. A certificate issued by said university was also annexed with the application.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner had applied in reserved category as she belongs to Bazigar caste which has been recognized as Scheduled Caste and a certificate in this regard was also attached, but still the case of the petitioner was not considered.

Petitioner moved representation dated 7.7.2010 (Annexure P-11) to respondent No.2 for consideration of her case but no decision was taken thereupon.

Learned counsel also submits that it has been held in review application No.42 of 2015 filed in CWP No. 20605 of 2012 that the petitioner belonging to Bazigar Caste/Vimukat Jati is entitled for 2% reservation but still petitioner has not been granted any benefit.

Learned counsel for respondent No.2 submits that petitioner applied in pursuance to advertisement issued in the year 2009 and not in the year 2010 and his case cannot be considered against the advertisement issued in the year 2010. Moreover petitioner applied in the category of SC (M&B) and not in the category of SC (R&O).

Without going into the controversy, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No. 2 to consider the representation of the petitioner as no order has been passed thereupon so far. The necessary exercise be done within a period of two months from date of receipt of certified copy of the order.

November 29, 2016
poonam

(DAYA CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes

Whether reportable

No