

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

CWP No. 444 of 2017

Anjana Bhaskar

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents.

CWP No. 445 of 2017

Kamalpreet Kaur

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents.

CWP No. 446 of 2017

Sandeep Kaur

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents.

CWP No. 447 of 2017

Hardeep Kaur

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents.

CWP No. 448 of 2017

Gaganveer Kaur

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents.

CWP No. 449 of 2017

Preetinder Kaur Sandhu

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents.

CWP No. 450 of 2017

Manjot Kaur

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents.

CWP No. 451 of 2017

Prabhjot Kaur

...Petitioner

**Vs.
State of Punjab and others**

...Respondents.

CWP No. 452 of 2017

Amandeep Kaur

...Petitioner

**Vs.
State of Punjab and others**

...Respondents.

CWP No. 647 of 2017

Harmanjot Kaur

...Petitioner

**Vs.
State of Punjab and others**

...Respondents.

CWP No. 648 of 2017

Subhneet Kaur

...Petitioner

**Vs.
State of Punjab and others**

...Respondents.

CWP No. 649 of 2017

Prabhjot Kaur

...Petitioner

**Vs.
State of Punjab and others**

...Respondents.

CWP No. 650 of 2017

Angrej Kumar

...Petitioner

**Vs.
State of Punjab and others**

...Respondents.

CWP No. 651 of 2017

Kuldeep Kumar

...Petitioner

**Vs.
State of Punjab and others**

...Respondents.

CWP No. 652 of 2017

Vijay Kumar

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents.

CWP No. 653 of 2017

Manees Kumar

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents.

CWP No. 4817 of 2017

Kanchan

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents.

Date of Decision: March 18, 2019.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE RAJAN GUPTA

Present: Mrs.Paramjit Kaur Deol, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Ms.Anu Chatrath, Addl.A.G.,Punjab.

Mr.Sarbjit Singh, Advocate
for respondent No.3 in CWP Nos. 444 to 452 of 2017.

Mr.Tarun Seth, Advocate
for respondent No.3 in CWP Nos. 647 to 563 of 2017.

Rajan Gupta, J (Oral)

This order will dispose of aforesaid bunch of petitions as
issue involved in all the petitions are same. Petitioners have sought a
direction that they be considered for appointment as Staff Nurses in the

General Category in the order of merit. Learned counsel for the petitioners has urged before the court that petitioners ought to have been considered by respondent No.4 for appointment as they fulfilled all the conditions and were allowed to sit in the examination.

Learned State counsel has filed the detailed reply. According to same, applications were invited online. Advertisement was issued on 25.7.2016 and corrigendum on 16.8.2016. Last date for submission of applications was 9.9.2016. All candidates who applied were allowed to appear as that was not the stage to verify whether they fulfilled the necessary eligible conditions. At the time of counselling, it was found that petitioners did not have the necessary registration with the Punjab Nursing Registration Council on the last date of application. Some of them even did not possess the requisite diploma. It was, thus, found that petitioners were not eligible even to apply for the post of Staff Nurse against the advertisement dated 25.7.2016.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and given careful thought to the facts and circumstances of the case.

It appears that there was a specific condition contained in The Punjab Health and Family Welfare Technical Service Rules, 2007 that candidate should be registered with the Punjab Nursing Council before the advertisement. Despite the fact that petitioners were not registered, they chose to apply for the post. At the time of counselling, it was noticed that they were not registered with the Punjab Nursing Council as required under the 2007 Rules. Some of them, even did not possess the diploma and thus, they were not offered appointment.

I find no infirmity with the decision taken by respondent No.4.

Plea of the petitioners that such registration could even be subsequent does not find favour with this court. Petitioners never posed a challenge to the Rules or the advertisement issued thereunder. The condition of possessing a registration from the Council is mandatory in nature. It is evident that petitioners were not eligible to apply on the last date of application i.e 9.9.2016. All the petitions are, thus, without any merit and are hereby dismissed.

(Rajan Gupta)
Judge

March 18, 2019.

BB

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