

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-2166-2018 (O&M)
Date of Decision:-01.02.2018.

Kamal Singh and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

Union of India and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P.B. BAJANTHRI

Present: Mr. V.S. Rana, Advocate for the petitioners.

P.B. BAJANTHRI, J. (Oral)

In the instant writ petition, petitioners' grievance is as follows:-

“i) Issue a writ in the nature of Mandamus directing the respondents to accept the applications of the petitioners and to grant them opportunity to participate in the selection process and to consider them eligible for imparting training at various divisions/units/workshops over Northern Railway and consider the candidature of the petitioners keeping in view the fact that the petitioners are Diploma Holders and they participated in the test for engagement of Apprentices for the year 2007-08 and were declared qualified but later on the result was cancelled and from 2008 to 2017 no vacancies were advertised and therefore, the petitioners being overage are eligible for competing the training at various divisions/units/workshops over Northern Railway.”

Respondents were proceeded to select candidates for

apprenticeship training with the Railway Authorities in the year 2007-08. Petitioners were stated to be selected. However, process of apprenticeship selection was stalled by the respondents-Railway Authorities. Petitioners approached Central Administrative Tribunal, whereas respondents in their written statement submitted that petitioners would be given opportunity of participation in the written test as decided by the competent authority. Such an undertaking was given in OA No.472/HR/09 that is way back 9 years. Now the respondents proceeded to give apprenticeship to the eligible candidates to be conducted by the respondents-Railway Authorities. Grievance of the petitioner is that once they are selected for apprenticeship they had the right, consequently, for future apprenticeship they are entitled to participate by giving age relaxation. Nearly 10 years have elapsed from the date of initial process. Question of granting 10 years age relaxation at this juncture may not be correct that too only for Apprenticeship and not for any appointment to the post. Accordingly, petitioners have not made out a case for age relaxation to Apprenticeship selection.

Petition stands dismissed.

(P.B. BAJANTHRI)
JUDGE

February 01, 2018.

sandeep

Whether speaking/reasoned:-

Yes / No

Whether Reportable:-

Yes / No.