

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

**CM Nos.2488 and 2489-LPA of 2016 in/and
LPA No.650 of 2015**

Date of decision: 26.07.2016

Sunita Goyal

.....Appellant

Versus

State of Punjab & ors.

.....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA KANT
HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE DARSHAN SINGH**

Present: Mr. K.B.Raheja, Advocate for the appellant.

Mr. Rajesh Bhardwaj, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

Mr. Sahil Soi, Advocate for

Mr. S.K.Sharma, Advocate for respondent No.5.

SURYA KANT, J (ORAL).

CM Nos.2488 and 2489-LPA of 2016

CMs are allowed. Annexure P-8 is taken on record.

LPA No.650 of 2015

The instant Letters Patent Appeal challenges the order dated 14.11.2013 whereby learned Single Judge dismissed the appellant's writ petition and has upheld the order dated 21.10.2009 whereby her services as Teaching Fellow on contractual basis, have been dispensed with.

The aforementioned action has been taken against the appellant for the reason that on engagement as a Teaching Fellow on contract basis, the experience certificate relied upon by her at the time of

selection was found to be bogus. The inquiry report on record which has

been appended with the writ petition suggests that the record of private school where the appellant claimed to have worked from August 1997 till January 1998 was summoned and lot of cuttings, over-writing, erasings etc. were found in the Teachers' Attendance Register. The appellant's reliance on Form No.19 under Employees' Provident Fund Scheme, 1952 (Annexure P-7) also does not advance her case as that application form does not bear any date and was submitted by her after "resigning" from the private school. When was this application form submitted is not known. The amount which the school is said to have deducted towards her provident fund account was ₹100/- only. Since all these documents were of doubtful nature, the inquiry team comprising three officers, held the experience certificate to be bogus and fake.

The learned Single Judge on consideration of the entire material has concurred the fact finding inquiry, which was admittedly conducted after giving adequate opportunity of hearing to the appellant.

We do not find any reason to differ with the opinion expressed by the learned Single Judge in this regard.

Dismissed.

**(SURYA KANT)
JUDGE**

**July 26, 2016
ps**

**(DARSHAN SINGH)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No