

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

CWP No.25907 of 2015 (O&M)

Date of decision: 26.03.2018

Rajwinder Kaur

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. Kewal Singh, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Ms. Monica Chhiber Sharma, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Jitendra Chauhan, J. (Oral)

By way of the present petition, the petitioner(s) seek(s) issuance of directions to the respondents to consider the case of the petitioner for appointment as Vocational Mistress (Computer Science) against the seats reserved for the candidates belonging to SC (R&O) category

Learned counsel for the petitioner refers to Annexure P-3 to contend that the petitioner's merit in category SC (R&O) is 53.0333 and her name figures at Sr. No.31. The candidate at Sr.No.40 having merit of 50.1429 which is lower than the merit of the petitioner, was directed to be appointed by this Court in CWP-21090-2013 (Annexure P-9). Out of total 8 posts of the said category, 03 posts are still lying vacant. The petitioner had represented to the competent authority but her case was not considered.

On the other hand, learned State counsel states that the petitioner did not appear in the counseling for Vocational Mistress (Computer Science), therefore, her claim was rightly rejected by the competent authority.

Heard, learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

The petitioner is claiming appointment as Vocational Mistress (Computer Science) against the seats reserved for candidates belonging to scheduled caste (R&O) category. The respondents had advertised total 78 posts of Vocational Masters/Mistresses, out of which 08 posts were reserved for scheduled caste (R&O) category. The petitioner who possessed B.A. B.Ed and M.Sc (IT) had applied against the post under reserved category, however, she does not fulfill the qualification as mentioned in the advertisement. Since the petitioner does not have the necessary qualification, therefore, the scrutiny/counselling committee had rejected the claim of the petitioner at an initial stage. Therefore, this Court feels that there is no infirmity or illegality in rejecting the claim of the petitioner.

Accordingly, the instant petition is dismissed.

26.03.2018

sumit.k

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

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