

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Letters Patent Appeal No. 295 of 2018 (O&M) in
CWP No. 22978 of 2017
Date of decision: 23.2.2018

Mandeep Kumar Gulia and another

.. Appellants

v.

Haryana Public Service Commission and others

.. Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BINDAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B. S. WALIA

Present: Mr. Chanderhas Yadav, Advocate for the appellants.

...

Rajesh Bindal J.

The order passed by the learned Single Judge dismissing the writ petition has been challenged by filing the present intra-court appeal.

The appellants applied for the post of Assistant Town Planner in pursuance to advertisement No. 7 dated 19.12.2015. Cut-off date fixed for considering the eligibility of the candidates was 18.1.2016. The essential qualifications required for the post are:

“(i) A post graduate degree in Urban & Regional Planning/ Urban Planning/ Regional Planning/ M. Tech in Planning (Urban, Traffic and Transport, Housing, Infrastructure), or equivalent making the holder eligible for associate membership of the Institute of Town Planners, India.

OR

B. Tech degree in Planning from a recognised Institute/ University with two years experience in the field of Town

Planning under a qualified Town Planner.

(ii) Hindi/Sanskrit upto Matric standard.”

It is not in dispute that the appellants did not possess the requisite qualifications on the cut-off date as they had merely been studying in final semester of Post Graduate course of Master of Urban and Rural Planning, meaning thereby, on the cut-off date, the appellants were not having educational qualifications required for the post.

The contention that corrigendum issued on 27.3.2017 will come to the rescue of the appellants is also mis-conceived for the reason that cut-off date as fixed in the advertisement initially issued was not extended. It is only that bifurcation of the number of posts was clarified. Initially, 22 posts were advertised, which did not contain any post in the category of PH (Ortho), whereas now one of the posts was provided for that, but the total number still remains the same.

For the reasons mentioned above, we do not find any error in the order passed by the learned Single Judge. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed. Consequently, the application for condonation of delay in filing the appeal is also dismissed.

(Rajesh Bindal)
Judge

(B. S. Walia)
Judge

23.2.2018
mk

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