

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

1. CWP-14703-2014 (O&M)
Date of decision : 29.04.2019

Amarjit Kaur and others

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondent(s)

2. CWP-24890-2014 (O&M)
Date of decision : 29.04.2019

Baljit Kaur

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondent(s)

3. CWP-24928-2014 (O&M)
Date of decision : 29.04.2019

Rama Kumari

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondent(s)

4. CWP-26055-2014 (O&M)
Date of decision : 29.04.2019

Ranjana Sharma

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. Surinder Garg, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) in CWP-14703-2014.

Mr. Munish Bhardwaj, Advocate,
for the petitioner(s) in CWP-24890-2014.

Mr. Naveen Batra, Advocate,
for the petitioner in CWP Nos.24928 & 26055 of 2014.

Mr. Navdeep Chhabra, DAG, Punjab,
assisted by Ms. Kulwinder Kaur, Sr. Asstt.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J.

The above noticed four writ petitions are being disposed of by this single judgment as common questions of law and facts are involved therein.

The common claim of all the petitioners, who are working as Anganwari Workers with the respondents, in the present batch of petitions is for selection against 286 posts of Supervisor advertised vide public notice dated 08.07.2013 (Annexure P-6).

In CWP-14703-2014, petitioner Nos.1 and 3 have passed higher secondary and are claiming that the said qualification be treated equivalent to 10+2, whereas, petitioner No.2 has passed prep/higher secondary and had also passed BA-I and BA-II. Petitioner No.2 is claiming that alternatively her educational qualification in BA-I and BA-II be treated equivalent to 10+2 and necessary weightage be given for academic achievement.

In CWP-24928-2014, the petitioner has claimed that she be appointed as Supervisor as she was placed at Sr. No.72 having 29.9 marks

in General Category i.e. Annexure P-6.

In CWP-26055-2014, the petitioner has claimed that she be given appointment as Supervisor as she was placed at Sr. No.55 having 30.59 marks in General Category (Annexure P-7).

In CWP-24890-2014, the petitioner has claimed that she has qualification of Higher Secondary and as such, she is entitled to weightage admissible towards academic qualification be given to the candidates having qualification of 10+2.

Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

Insofar as CWP-14703-2014 is concerned, the learned State counsel states that petitioner No.2 is otherwise in the merits list even without adding the marks of BA-I and BA-II.

In view of the statement so made, learned counsel for the petitioners seeks to withdraw the petition qua petitioner No.2.

As regards the claim of petitioner nos.1 and 3 is concerned, reference can be placed on letter dated 25.11.2013 (Annexure R-1), wherein, it has been laid down that Higher Secondary/Prep passed under the old system can be treated equivalent to 10+1 under the present system. Therefore, the claim of petitioner Nos.1 and 2 is not maintainable. Similarly, the claim of the petitioner in CWP-24890-2014 also deserves to be rejected as she being higher secondary pass, cannot be considered to be equivalent to 10+2.

As regards the claim of petitioner in CWP-24928-2014 is concerned, it has come on record that 52 vacancies of Supervisor under General Category were to be given to the 'Matriculate' category. This

petitioner has been placed at Serial No.72 of the merit list. No candidate lower in merit than the petitioner has been selected. Similarly, the petitioner in CWP-26055-2014 has been placed at Sr. No.55 and she too, could not make it to the selection list.

In view of the above, CWP-14709-2014 qua petitioner Nos.1 and 3, as well as CWP Nos.24890, 24928 and 26055 of 2014, are hereby, dismissed.

Photocopy of this order be placed on the file(s) of the connected case(s).

29.04.2019
atulsethi

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

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