

Sr.no.117

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA CHANDIGARH

CWP NO.227 OF 2018(O&M)

Date of Decision: 11.01.2018

Jyoti Devi

.....Petitioner

versus

Central Administrative Tribunal, Chandigarh and othersRespondents

**CORAM HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MAHESH GROVER
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJBIR SEHRAWAT**

Present Mr.Anil Kumar Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

MAHESH GROVER, J(ORAL)

The present petition is directed against the judgment of the Central Administrative Tribunal, Chandigarh Bench, Chandigarh dated 04.09.2017. The selection process was embarked upon by the respondents and the controversy centres around only one aspect. In the advertisement qualification prescribed for PGT Hindi was as follows:-

“8. *HINDI*

i) *Graduate or its equivalent from a recognized University with Hindi as an elective subject with at least 50% marks;*

ii) *Bachelor of Education Degree recognized by NCTE with at least 50% marks in aggregate or its equivalent with Hindi as teaching subject;*

iii) *Pass in Teacher Eligibility Test (TET) conducted by the CBSE New Delhi in accordance with the Guidelines framed by the NCTE is compulsory.*

CWP NO.227 OF 2018(O&M) -2-

The petitioner concededly is a graduate with Hindi as an elective subject. The grievance stems from the fact that persons with higher qualification in Hindi subject such as Hons. etc. were also considered eligible which widened the arena of candidates up for consideration, thereby minimizing the chances of selection of the petitioner who was merely a graduate with Hindi as an elective subject. It is not the case of the petitioner that some additional marks were given on account of a candidate possessing higher qualification in Hindi and, therefore, his argument that Rules have been changed would carry no weight. The Expert Committee constituted for the purposes of determining the equivalence of the essential qualification as an alternate also opined that incumbents with additional or higher qualification in Hindi ought also to be considered eligible.

After hearing learned counsel for the petitioner and appraising the impugned judgment and the material on record, we do not find any reason to interfere with the opinion of the Expert Committee which has considered higher qualification of B.A (Hons.) in Hindi as relevant qualification for the posts in question. Even otherwise, plea of the petitioner is too far fetched as it is not her case that she was not considered eligible but the case is that since more people came into the zone of consideration by the act of the Committee of Experts that has reduced her chances of selection and employment.

This, to our mind, is not a grievance well founded. No ground to interfere with the impugned order is made out.

CWP NO.227 OF 2018(O&M) -3-

The present petition is, therefore, dismissed.

(MAHESH GROVER)
JUDGE

11.01.2018 **(RAJBIR SEHRAWAT)**
mamta **JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No