

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP No.3432 of 2017 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 24.07.2017

Shallu Bathla

--Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

--Respondents

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

Present:- Mr. Vijay Rana, Advocate for the petitioner.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.J

C.M. No.9693 of 2017

Application is allowed as prayed for.

The B.Ed certificate is taken on record at Annexure P-1.

Main Case

Pleadings on record would indicate that the petitioner had applied for the post of P.G.T (English) in pursuance to advertisement dated 1.10.2012 (Annexure P-3) issued by the Punjab School Education Department Recruitment Board.

Counsel submits that a total of 21 posts of P.G.T (English) were advertised and out of which 11 were to be filled up from amongst the General Category.

Petitioner belongs to the General Category.

The essential qualification for the post in question and as laid down in the advertisement was M.A or M.Sc. or M.Com with B.T or B.Ed in the concerned subject.

As per counsel, a written examination was conducted and in which the petitioner has secured 63.0390% marks.

Grievance raised in the instant petition is that candidates lower in merit and under the General Category have been called for the Interview, whereas the petitioner has been denied consideration for appointment to the post in question.

It is the contention raised by counsel that even though, no formal order has been passed and communicated, yet, the petitioner is being considered ineligible on the ground that the qualification possessed by the petitioner has been acquired from the Distance Mode of Education. The submission advanced by counsel is not supported by any document/order placed on record.

Under such circumstances, the prayer of the petitioner seeking directions to the respondents to call her for the Interview and to be given appointment to the post of P.G.T (English), cannot be adjudicated upon.

In view of the above, I deem it appropriate to dispose of the instant petition with a direction to respondents no.2 and 3 to look into the grievance of the petitioner in the light of a legal notice dated 28.12.2016 (Annexure P-6) i.e. stated to have already been served.

Suffice it to observe that in case the petitioner is not being considered eligible in the light of her qualifications held, the respondent authorities would be obligated to convey to the petitioner the reasons for disqualification and holding the petitioner to be ineligible.

Disposed of.

(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE

24.07.2017
lucky

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether Reportable: No