

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.4656 of 2018

Date of Decision: 27.02.2018

Jitender

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV NARAIN RAINA

Present: Mr. Ravinder Singh Dhull, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

RAJIV NARAIN RAINA, J. (Oral)

1. Power Lifting is not one of the enumerated sports in the Haryana policy dated November 30, 1993 on the subject of reservation of seats and posts in Technical/Medical Institutions & State Govt. services for Sports quota. Sports gradation certificates are issued only for the sporting activities for Olympic Games and Non-Olympic Games mentioned in the policy. Weight Lifting is at item 10 of the Olympic games but does not find mention in the Non Olympic games. Power Lifting and Weight Lifting are not one and the same thing.

2. The petitioner applied for the post of Heavy Vehicle Driver in the category of Outstanding Sports Person (General). He qualified the driving test conducted by the Haryana Staff Selection Commission. He was called scrutiny of documents but his candidature has been rejected because he was unable to produce a sports gradation certificate issued by the

competent authority in the field of Power Lifting.

3. The Commission committed has no error in refusing to entertain the candidature of the petitioner at the stage of interview when the sporting activity is not included in the Haryana Government policy. The interview process is under way to be completed by March 01, 2018. In any case, it is too late to interject and put the Commission and the State to notice to show cause why Power Lifting should not be included in the list of sporting activities while not forgetting that the Court has no such power to include an activity in the sports policy. If the petitioner's case is entertained at this stage it would result in chaos and the entire selection may be jeopardized or to be started afresh to give an opportunity to all equally placed persons in the job market. There may be Power Lifters who have not responded to the advertisement finding themselves ineligible. This is an additional reason why this Court would refuse to entertain this petition. It is not the business of the Court to make policy or create inroads in an existent policy by adding new features to the policy on personal fancies.

4. The petition is devoid of merit and is accordingly dismissed.

(RAJIV NARAIN RAINA)
JUDGE

27.02.2018
manju

Whether speaking/reasoned *Yes*

Whether reportable *No*