

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Civil Writ Petition No.2982 of 2012

Date of decision: 2.2.2016

Hari Singh Raghuvanshi

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE G.S.SANDHAWALIA

Present: None for the petitioner.

Mr.L.S.Virk, Addl. Advocate General, Punjab.

Mr. Anil Sharma, Advocate for respondent no.3.

G.S.SANDHAWALIA, J. (Oral)

The petitioner seeks appointment as Veterinary Officer with respondent no.3-Zila Parishad, Bathinda.

Admittedly as per terms of the advertisement dated 26.11.2010 (Annexure P/3) and the conditions prescribed therein the candidate had to be in the age group of 21 to 35 years as on 1.12.2010. The petitioner admittedly was not considered on account of his age being beyond 35 years. His grouse was noticed by this Court that respondent no.4 was also above the age of 35 years and he was also a general category candidate and thus he had been wrongly appointed.

In the written statement filed, it has been clarified that firstly there is delay of two years in filing of the present petition as advertisement was issued in the year 2010 and the petition was filed in the year 2012. Secondly no candidate who did not fulfill the requisite prescribed conditions in the advertisement have been considered by respondent no.3. The petitioner has given the reference to selection made by Zila Parishad, Ludhiana in the year 2009 for which he had not applied and neither the said Zila Parishad has been impleaded as party to the petition and the

appointment of respondent no.4 was with said Zila Parishad.

No replication has been filed to controvert the said pleadings.
Even on the last date none was present to represent the petitioner.

In such circumstances, this Court is of the opinion that there is no scope for interference in exercise of jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

Accordingly, the present writ petition is dismissed.

February 02, 2016
Pka

(G.S.SANDHAWALIA)
Judge