

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

CWP No.19654 of 2014 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 08.05.2019

Dinesh Yadav

... Petitioner

Versus

Central University of Haryana and another

... Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

Present:- Mr. J.P.Sharma, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sumeet Goel and
Mr. Samir Rathaur, Advocates
for respondent No.1.

Mr. R.K.Malik, Senior Advocate with
Mr. S.K.Rana, Advocate,
for respondent No.2.

ARUN MONGA, J.(ORAL)

The petitioner, *inter alia*, seeks issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari to quash the appointment of respondent No.2 to the post of 'Junior Engineer' (Electrical) on the ground that as on the last date of submission of application i.e. 30.09.2013 in response to the advertisement (Annexure P-1), he was not eligible on the ground of lack of requisite qualification along with prescribed minimum work experience.

2. The petitioner has made a specific averment in para 10 of his writ petition alleging that if the respondents were honest and fair, they should provide proof of qualification and work experience of respondent No.2 while filing their written statement duly verified from the concerned authority.

3. Per contra, learned counsel appearing for the University submits that representative of the University is present in Court along with original records. He has shown the degree of respondent No.2, in course of the hearing, which has been granted by Kurukshetra University, certifying that he has qualified B.Tech. in Electrical and the said degree was issued in December, 2010.

4. Plea of the petitioner was that respondent No.1-University allowed the respondent No.2 to appear in the examination despite being declared ineligible initially as reflected from Annexure P-2. Learned Senior counsel for respondent No.2 in response thereto submits that Annexure P-2 was uploaded only for the benefit of the candidates to correct the discrepancies in their applications before the date of interview and hence, respondent No.2 was allowed to appear for the interview provisionally vide corrigendum Annexure R 2/3.

5. As regards, the work experience certificate, learned Senior Counsel, Mr. R.K.Malik, Advocate for respondent No.2 submits that same have been appended as Annexure R-2/1 and R-2/2 and were duly considered by respondent No.1-University at the time of verification, to be carried out to ascertain the eligibility of the applicant.

6. In the aforesaid premise, I do not find any ground to interfere in the appointment of respondent No.2 and the writ petition is, accordingly, dismissed with no order as to costs.

(ARUN MONGA)
JUDGE

08.05.2019
vandana

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No