

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP No.17419 of 2017 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 08.08.2017

Harkomal Singh

--Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

--Respondents

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

Present:- Mr. Shalender Mohan & Ms. Alisha Soni,
Advocates for the petitioners.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.J

Pleadings on record indicate that the petitioner acquired the qualifications of B.A/B.Ed from Magadh University, Bodh Gaya, Bihar. Petitioner was selected and appointed on the post of Punjabi Master on 30.1.1997 on the strength of such qualification. Services of the petitioner were terminated in the year 2006 on the ground that upon verification it was found that the qualifications possessed by the petitioner of B.A/B.Ed were fake.

Apparently, a third person namely Surdip Singh filed an application under the R.T.I Act and on the basis of which petitioner raised a claim that he had cleared both the examinations of B.A/B.Ed in first grade in the month of June, 1994 and June, 1995 respectively. Based on such information petitioner filed an appeal before the Director (S.E.) Punjab seeking reinstatement on the ground that the verification earlier conducted by the university was erroneous.

Petitioner was reinstated back in service on 11.8.2011.

The instant petition has been filed raising a grievance that with a clear objective to harass and humiliate the petitioner an exercise of re-

verification of the educational degrees possessed by the petitioner has been initiated vide impugned order dated 30.5.2017 (Annexure P-4).

Perusal of the impugned order would reveal that it is a communication from the S.D.O (S.S), Sangrur and addressed to the Director (S.E.) (S.S), Punjab and in which an advise had been sought as to whether the certificates possessed by the petitioner are required to be re-verified or not?

Clearly as on date there is no specific order placed on record or put to challenge and wherefrom it may be inferred that a decision to reverify the educational qualifications of the petitioner has been directed.

The writ petition is premature and is accordingly, dismissed.

(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE

08.08.2017

lucky

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable:	Yes/No