

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 10940 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 21.07.2016.

Abhilasha Gautam

--Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

--Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.

Present:- Mr. Raje Ram Kaushik, Advocate for the petitioner.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.J

The petitioner, who is stated to be working on the post of Science Mistress under the Department of Education, State of Haryana has raised a two fold claim in the instant petition. First prayer is for the issuance of a Writ of Mandamus directing the respondents to consider the qualification possessed by the petitioner i.e. Master's Degree in Industrial Chemistry at par with Master's Degree in Chemistry. The second prayer is to direct the respondent department to consider the petitioner for promotion to the post of School Lecturer/P.G.T (Chemistry).

Against the backdrop of the prayers raised in the petition, counsel was confronted that this Court lacks the expertise to go into the aspect and question of equivalence of qualification i.e. a Master's Degree in Industrial Chemistry to be treated at par with Master's Degree in Chemistry. Counsel would respond by submitting that certain other candidates, who possessed the same very qualification i.e. Master's Degree in Industrial Chemistry, have been considered and promoted to the post of School Lecturer/P.G.T. (Chemistry). Even though, such assertion has been made during the course of arguments but there are no pleadings/material placed

on record to substantiate such assertion.

Furthermore, counsel was put a specific query as to whether the post of School Lecturer/P.G.T (Chemistry) and to which the petitioner is staking a claim to be considered for promotion is governed by any statutory rules to examine the qualifications prescribed for the post and as to whether the petitioner herself is eligible, the response has been in the affirmative. In spite thereof the rules have neither been appended along with the petition and nor they have been referred to during the course of arguments.

Under such situation, the prayer made in the present petition can neither be entertained nor examined.

Petition is dismissed.

(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE

21.07.2016
lucky