

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

L.P.A. No.1220 of 2015 (O&M) in
Civil Writ Petition No.5781 of 2015
Reserved on : August 21, 2019
Date of decision: November 13, 2019

State of Haryana and others ...Appellants

Versus

Subhash Chand ...Respondent

2. **C.W.P. No.5642 of 2015 (O&M)**

Meena Kumari ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others ...Respondents

3. **L.P.A. No.1144 of 2018 (O&M)**

State of Haryana and others ...Appellants

Versus

Dhanpati Devi ...Respondent

4. **L.P.A. No.1392 of 2018 (O&M)**

State of Haryana and others ...Appellants

Versus

Savita Rani ...Respondent

5. **L.P.A. No.1429 of 2018 (O&M)**

State of Haryana and others ...Appellants

Versus

Shakuntla Devi ...Respondent

6. **L.P.A. No.1437 of 2018 (O&M)**

State of Haryana and others ...Appellants

Versus

Anil Kumar ...Respondent

7. **L.P.A. No.1526 of 2018 (O&M)**

State of Haryana and others ...Appellants

Versus

Balwan Singh ...Respondent

8. **L.P.A. No.1570 of 2018 (O&M)**

State of Haryana and others ...Appellants

Versus

Khazan Singh ...Respondent

9. **L.P.A. No.1571 of 2018 (O&M)**

State of Haryana and others ...Appellants

Versus

Parmila Rani ...Respondent

10. **L.P.A. No.1573 of 2018 (O&M)**

State of Haryana and others ...Appellants

Versus

Surender Kumar ...Respondent

11. **L.P.A. No.1576 of 2018 (O&M)**
State of Haryana and others ...Appellants
Versus
Yatender Kumar ...Respondent
12. **L.P.A. No.1578 of 2018 (O&M)**
State of Haryana and others ...Appellants
Versus
Vinti Gulati ...Respondent
13. **L.P.A. No.1579 of 2018 (O&M)**
State of Haryana and others ...Appellants
Versus
Phool Kumar ...Respondent
14. **L.P.A. No.1651 of 2018 (O&M)**
State of Haryana and others ...Appellants
Versus
Baby Goyal ...Respondent
15. **L.P.A. No.1652 of 2018 (O&M)**
State of Haryana and others ...Appellants
Versus
Bela Rani ...Respondent
16. **L.P.A. No.1659 of 2018 (O&M)**

State of Haryana and others ...Appellants

Versus

Shakuntla Devi ...Respondent

17. **L.P.A. No.1660 of 2018 (O&M)**

State of Haryana and others ...Appellants

Versus

Mamta Sharma ...Respondent

18. **L.P.A. No.1672 of 2018 (O&M)**

State of Haryana and others ...Appellants

Versus

Abhilasha Arora ...Respondent

AND

19. **L.P.A. No.1773 of 2018 (O&M)**

State of Haryana and others ...Appellants

Versus

Rajesh ...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHARMA,
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARINDER SINGH SIDHU**

Present: Mr.Lokesh Sinhal, Addl.AG, Haryana.

Mr.Anurag Goyal, Advocate for the respondents.

HARINDER SINGH SIDHU, J.

This judgment shall dispose of 18 Letters Patent Appeals and 01 Civil Writ Petition, bearing LPA No.1220 of 2015, LPA No.1144 of 2018, LPA No.1392 of 2018, LPA No.1429 of 2018, LPA No.1437 of 2018, LPA No.1526 of 2018, LPA No.1570 of 2018, LPA No.1571 of 2018, LPA No.1573 of 2018, LPA No.1576 of 2018, LPA No.1578 of 2018, LPA No.1579 of 2018, LPA No.1651 of 2018, LPA No.1652 of 2018, LPA No.1659 of 2018, LPA No.1660 of 2018, LPA No.1672 of 2018, LPA No.1773 of 2018 and CWP No.5642 of 2015 as the issues raised therein are identical.

2. The Letters Patent Appeals have been filed by the State of Haryana and others against the common judgment dated 04.06.2015 of the Ld. Single Judge in CWP No.5781 of 2015 titled 'Subhash Chand vs. State of Haryana and others' and other connected cases. CWP No.5642 of 2015 has been filed by Meena Kumari – petitioner challenging the cancellation of her selection on the ground of being overage.

3. Challenge in the writ petitions out of which the present LPAs arise was to the action of the appellants herein whereby they had cancelled the selection of the petitioner-respondents on the ground of being overage. Vide the aforesaid common judgment the Ld. Single Judge allowed the writ petitions and held that the petitioners were eligible for the post of PGT teachers in terms of the Instructions dated 25.6.1981 and 12.02.1982 of the State of Haryana which stipulate that if a B.Ed./ M.Ed trained applicant within the age prescribed as per the Rules got his name registered with the

employment exchange and became overage before getting regular appointment in that case the applicants would be considered within age upto the time they were regularly appointed on the basis of B.Ed/M.Ed. They would be entitled to relaxation in age for this purpose.

4. For facility of reference the facts are being taken from LPA No. 1220 of 2015.

5. Vide Advertisement No.1/2012 dated 7.6.2012 (Annexure P-1), the Teachers Selection Board (for short “the Board”) invited applications for filling up the post of Post Graduate Teachers (PGT) HES-II (Group-B) Services for different subjects. There were 1700 post of PGT (Hindi) at Category 13 . Candidates were to apply online. The online application could be filled upto 28th June 2012.

6. The eligibility common to all posts was:

“Eligibility:

(a) Matric with Hindi/Sanskrit or 10+2/B.A./M.A. with Hindi as one of the subject.

(b) Certificate of having qualified Haryana Teacher Eligibility Test (HTET)/ School Teachers Eligibility Test (STET) of respective subject for the post applied, conducted by Board of School Education Haryana, Bhiwani/ One time exemption of HTET (See Note-2).

(c) Consistent good academic record (See Note-1).

(d) Essential qualification (EQ) is given with each Post.

Age:- 18-40 years, relaxation as given in special instructions.

For Teachers upper age relaxation (see Note-3).”

Note 3 for upper age relaxation referred to above is as under:

“One time exemption certificate for HTET/STET & one time

upper age relaxation certificate from Head of the institute is required to be verified by DEO & counter signed by Director of Secondary Education of the concerned State. One time implies that an applicant can apply only once for a particular category of post in the first advertisement. No such exemption will be granted in the subsequent advertisement.”

This note is not relevant for the present case.

Special Instructions were listed in Appendix-A. Clause-3 thereof reads as under:-

“Candidates applying for a post must ensure that they fulfill all the eligibility conditions on the last date of application. If on verification at any time before or after the written examination or interview or appointment, it is found that they do not fulfill any of the eligibility conditions or it is found that the information furnished is false or incorrect their candidature will be cancelled.”

7. The petitioner submitted his application before the cut-of-date.

His age as on 28.06.2012 , the last date for submission of applications, was 43 years 06 months and 14 days. Against the relevant column in the application form he mentioned that he was registered with the employment exchange before attaining the age of 40 years and that his name still exists as registered unemployed. The relevant entries in his application form were as under:-

<i>“Registration Number</i>	<i>11308833</i>
<i>Post Applied for</i>	<i>PGT Hindi (Cat.No.13)</i>
<i>Applicant’s Name</i>	<i>Shubash Chand PHOTO</i>
<i>Father’s Name</i>	<i>Telu Ram</i>
<i>Mother’s Name</i>	<i>Savitri Devi</i>
<i>Date of Birth</i>	<i>1/1/1969</i>
<i>Age as on 28.06.2012</i>	<i>43 years 6 months 14 days</i>

<i>Gender</i>	<i>Male</i>
<i>Marital Status</i>	<i>Married</i>
<i>Nationality</i>	<i>INDIAN</i>
<i>Category</i>	<i>General Sub Category</i>
<i>District Mewat Cadre</i>	<i>NO</i>
<i>Are you working as Guest Teacher in Haryana</i>	<i>NO</i>
<i>Upper Age relaxation required:</i>	<i>3 years 6 months 14 days</i>
<i>Certificate of having qualified Haryana Teachers Eligibility Test (HTET)/ School Teacher Eligibility Test (STET) of respective Subject for the post applied, conducted by Board of School Education Haryana, Bhiwani.</i>	<i>YES</i>

<i>xxx</i>	<i>xxx</i>	<i>xxx</i>
<i>“Whether registered in Employment Exchange before attaining the age of 40 years and still name exists as registered unemployed?”</i>		<i>YES”</i>

8. The petitioner was called for interview/ scrutiny of documents vide admit card dated 16.07.2012. He appeared before the concerned Committee on 11.02.2013. The Committee verified his documents. The result was declared by the Board on its website on 01.01.2014. The petitioner was shown as qualified/selected. However no appointment letter was issued to him. He received show cause notice dated 15.07.2014 (Annexure P-8) calling upon him to show cause why his candidature should not be cancelled on the ground of his being over-age. The show cause notice stated that as per the advertisement the age for direct recruitment of PGT is 18 to 40 years. The appointment is governed by Haryana State School Cadre (Group-B) Service Rules, 2012 (for short “2012 Rules”). As

per the 2012 Rules the age prescribed for appointment is that the person should not be less than eighteen years or more than forty years on the last date of submission of application form. Under the Rules there is provision for relaxation only in respect of teachers working in Government aided/recognised and government school to the extent of service rendered by them as a teacher subject to maximum of five years. The date of birth of the petitioner being 01.01.1969 he was more than 40 years on the date of application and was hence not eligible being overage. The petitioner submitted reply to the show cause notice stating that he had been registered with the Employment Exchange on 06.07.1995. He got himself registered again on 14.06.2012 which registration was valid upto March, 2017. He placed reliance on the Instructions of the Government dated 25.06.1981 and 12.02.1982 to claim relaxation in age.

9. Despite his reply, no final decision regarding the appointment of the petitioner was taken. He filed CWP No.18876 of 2014 seeking directions that he be issued appointment. The petition was disposed of on 11.09.2014 with a direction to the competent authority to pass a speaking order regarding the candidature of the petitioner for the post of PGT (Hindi). Thereafter order dated 14.10.2014 was passed rejecting his claim on the ground that he was not eligible being over-age. Rejecting the claim of the petitioner for relaxation in view of the instructions dated 25.06.1981 and 12.02.1982 it was stated that these instructions had not been incorporated in the 2012 Rules and hence could not be relied upon. Also the Government had not relaxed any of the provisions of the Rules with respect

to any class or category of persons.

10. Petitioner filed CWP No.5781 of 2015 assailing the order. Ld. Single Judge allowed the writ petition and a bunch of connected writ petitions holding that even after the coming into force of the 2012 Rules the instructions dated 25.06.1981 and 12.02.1982 continued to exist and the petitioners were entitled to the benefit in terms thereof. The appellants herein were directed to call the petitioners for counselling and issue appointment letters to them. They were also held entitled to the consequential benefit of seniority. The State of Haryana has filed these LPAs against the judgment of the Ld. Single Judge.

11. Before proceeding further it would be necessary to reproduce the the relevant service Rules and the instructions.

12. The recruitment of PGT teachers is governed by the Haryana State Education School Cadre (Group B) Service Rules, 2012.

Rule 5 thereof prescribes the age for eligibility and is as under:

“5. No person shall be appointed to the post in the service by direct recruitment on contract basis who is less than eighteen years or more than forty years of age or such age as fixed by the Government, from time to time on the last date of submission of application to the recruiting agency.

Provided that teachers working in privately managed Government aided, recognised and Government schools, shall be given age relaxation in upper age limit to the extent of service rendered by them as a teacher subject to a maximum of five years. However, the said relaxation shall be as a onetime measure only”

Rule 17 is the relaxation provision and reads as under:

“ 17. Where the Government is of the opinion that it is necessary or expedient to do so, it may, by order, for reasons to be recorded in writing, relax any of the provisions of these rules with respect to any class or category or persons.”

Rule 20 is the repealing clause and reads as under:-

“20. The Haryana State Education (School and Inspection) Cadre (Group B) Service Rules, 1998 and the Haryana State Education Lecturer School Cadre (Group C) Service Rules, 1998 in so far as they are applicable to the posts included in the Service are hereby repealed:

Provided that any order made or action taken under the rules so repealed shall be deemed to have been made or taken under corresponding provisions of these rules.”

13. Before the promulgation of 2012 Rules the Service was governed by the Haryana State Education Lecturer School Cadre (Group-C) Rules, 1998. (for short “ 1998 Rules”).

Rule 5 was the provision regarding age and is as under:-

“5. No person shall be appointed to any post in the Service by direct recruitment who is less than 17 years or more than 35 years of age on or before 1st day of the month preceding the last date of submission of application to the Commission.”

Rule 17 contained the power of relaxation and is as under:-

“Power of relaxation:

17. Where the Government is of the opinion that it is necessary or expedient to do so, it may, by order, for reasons to be recorded in writing, relax any of the provisions of these rules with respect to any class or category or persons.”

Rule 20 is the 'Repeal and Savings' clause and is as under:-

“Repeal and savings:

20. Any rule applicable to the services and corresponding to

any of these rules, which is enforced immediately before the commencement of these rules is hereby repealed;”

14. Before the 1998 Rules, the Punjab Educational Service Class-III School Cadre Rules, 1955 (for short “1955 Rules”) were in force. Rule 4 of the 1955 Rules prescribed ‘Nationality, age and other qualifications’ for a candidate. Rule 4(b)(iii) deals with the age and is as under:-

(iii) He/She is not more than 25 years of age;

Provided that the Director, may for special reasons to be recorded in writing, appoint a person over 25 years of age.

Provided further that the maximum age limit for the members of the Scheduled Castes/Tribes and Backward Classes shall be 30 years.”

Rule 14 of the 1955 Rules provides for relaxation of rules as under: :

“Relaxation of rules, etc. - Where the Government is satisfied that the operation of any of these rules causes any undue hardship in a particular case, it may by order, dispense with or relax the requirement of that rule to such extent and subject to such conditions as it may consider necessary for dealing with the case in a just and equitable manner. Provided that where any such rule is applicable in the case of any person, the case shall not be dealt with in any manner less favourable to him than that provided in that rule.”

15. The Instructions/ letters dated 25.06.1981 and 12.02.1982 are reproduced below:

“Copy letter No.32/104/80-Edu.III(4) dated 25.6.1981 sent to Director, School Education, Haryana, Chandigarh from financial Commissioner & Secretary, Govt.of Haryana, Department of Education.

Sub:- Extension in age for B.Ed.Teachers for entry into Govt.

service.

The Government has considered on the issue and decided that if any B.Ed/M.Ed. Trained applicant within the age prescribed as per the Rules got his name registered with the Employment Office and got over aged before getting regular employment in that case these applicants would be considered within age up to the time they are regularly appointed on the basis of B.Ed./M.Ed. For this purpose, relaxation in age be given as per the requirement. You are hereby requested that as per this decision concerned officer/institutions may be given directions accordingly and copy of the same may be sent to the Govt.”

“Copy letter no.32/104/80-Edu.-1-II (4) dated 12.2.1982 sent to Director, School Education, Haryana from Financial Commissioner & Secretary, Govt.of Haryana Department of Education.

Sub: Extension in age of C&V Lecturer for entry into Govt. service.

This is in reference to your letter no.8407-12/24-77 even (2) dated 11.12.1981 on the subject cited above. The government has considered the issue and decided that if any classical/vernacular and School Lecturer Trained applicant within the age prescribed as per the Rules got his name registered with the Employment Office and got over aged before getting regular employment in that case these applicants would be considered within age up to the time they are regularly appointed as C&V School Lecturer. For this purpose relaxation in age be given as per the requirement. You are hereby requested that as per this decision concerned officer/institutions may be given directions accordingly and copy of the same may be sent to the Govt.”

16. The sole question for consideration in these appeals is whether the instructions dated 25.06.1981 and 12.02.1982 continued to exist or are deemed to have ceased to exist on the promulgation of the 2012 Rules.

17. Before proceeding to consider that issue it may be necessary to refer to certain orders passed by this Court during the pendency of these appeals and the response of the State.

On 29.07.2016 the following order was passed:-

“Under the 1998 Rules notified on 01.12.1998, Rule 5 mandated that a person should not be more than 35 years of age on or before 1st day of the month preceding the last date of submission of the application to the Commission. These Rules remained in force till were repealed on April 11, 2012 by a new set of Rules. We direct the Principal Secretary, Education Department to file a status report-cum-affidavit whether during the period when 1998 Rules were in force, the benefit in age relaxation as per Government instructions dated 25.06.1981 (Annexure P5) and 12.02.1982 (Annexure P6) to those candidates whose names were registered with the Employment Exchange, was granted or not and if granted then how Rule 5 of 1998 Rules was construed?

List on 22.09.2016.”

18. Pursuant thereto a status report by way of affidavit of Sh.P.K.Dass, Additional Chief Secretary to Government of Haryana, School Education Department was filed. In paragraph 3 it was stated that as per official record on the recommendation of the Haryana Public Service Commission dated 15.10.2008 one Smt. Bahteri Devi d/o Sh.Bhim Singh was appointed as Lecturer in Sanskrit vide order dated 09.01.2009 under

the 1998 Rules. Her date of birth was 15.01.1963. She was 43 years when the posts were advertised in 2006. As her name was registered with Employment Exchange Kalanaur (Rohtak) on 19.07.1996 she was appointed granting the age relaxation as per Instructions dated 25.06.1981 and 12.02.1982.

19. In paragraph 4 of the affidavit it was stated that the Departmental Instructions dated 25.06.1981 and 12.02.1982 were issued when the Punjab Education Service Class-III School Cadre Rules 1955 were in force under which maximum age for entry into government service was 25 years. Till 1998 the maximum age remained at 35 years. So the benefit of relaxation in upper age limit was granted to the candidates seeking employment prior to amendment of the Rules in 2012 as per Departmental Instructions dated 25.06.1981 and 12.2.1982.

20. On 06.04.2017 the following order was passed:-

“In deference to the order dated 29.07.2016, Mr.PK Das, Additional Chief Secretary, Government of Haryana, School Education Department has filed affidavit dated 06.02.2017 explaining, inter alia, that there is a complete shift to the concept of maximum age limit after the 2012 Rules have come into force, for under these Rules the age limit for entry into Government service was initially 40 years which has been further enhanced to 42 years vide notification dated 26.08.2014.

It may be true that with the enhancement of age limit for entry into Government service, the Instructions dated 25.06.1981 and 12.02.1982 have become redundant but the fact of the matter is that those Instructions have not been

withdrawn till date. Still further, these Instructions are not contrary to the Rules, rather are supplemental, as can be seen from the contents of the Instructions where it is provided that the relaxation in age limit under these Instructions shall be granted over and above the maximum age limit prescribed under the Service Rules.

In this view of the matter, let the State Government take a conscious decision as to whether or not the instructions dated 25.06.1981 and 12.02.1982 be withdrawn? Secondly, let the claim of the respondents who have already been selected be considered for one time relaxation in age as it would not affect the State policy in any manner. After withdrawal of Instructions, the State Government can legitimately insist that the age limit should in future be restricted as per the Rules.

List on 09.10.2017.

*Let a **Dasti** copy of this order be handed over to Mr.Lokesh Sinhal, Addl. A.G. Haryana for information and necessary compliance.”*

21. An affidavit of Rajiv Rattan, Director Secondary Education, Haryana Panchkula dated 06.10.2017 was filed in which it has been stated that Government Instructions dated 25.06.1981 and 12.02.1982 have been withdrawn vide order dated 14.06.2017 being contrary to the provisions of age relaxation provided in the 2012 Rules.

The said order is as under:-

*“Government of Haryana
School Education Department
Order No.13/44-2015 PGT-I(1) Dated: 14.06.2017*

*Though the instructions No.32/104/80-Edu-III(4) dated
25.06.1981 and 32/104/80-Edu-1-II(4) dated 12.02.1982 had*

become irrelevant after framing of recruitment rules 2012 providing for sufficient raising of the upper age limit as well as relaxation for the teachers serving in private schools, yet, for the formality sake, these instructions are hereby formally withdrawn so that no confusion or difficulty may not subsist.

*(P.K.Das)
Additional Chief Secretary to Govt.
Haryana, School Education Department
Chandigarh”*

It is in this background that the question falls for determination.

22. The Departmental Instructions/ letters dated 25.06.1981 and 12.02.1982 were issued when the Punjab Education Service Class-III School Cadre Rules 1955 were in force. The maximum age prescribed by these Rules was 25 years. The Director could however for special reasons to be recorded appoint a person over 25 years of age. The maximum age for Scheduled Castes/ Tribes and Backward Classes was 30 years. Rule 14 empowered the Government to relax the requirement of any rule in case it caused undue hardship in a particular case. On 1.12.1998 the Haryana State Education Lecturer School Cadre (Group-C) Rules, 1998 were brought into force. The age for entry into service by direct recruitment was specified in Rule 5 as not less than 17 years or more than 35 years on or before the 1st day of the month preceding the last date of submission of application to the Commission. Rule 17 of the 1998 Rules gave power to the Government to relax for reasons to be recorded any of the of the provisions of the Rules with respect to any class or category of persons. Rule 20 of these Rules which is the Repeal and Saving clause provided that any Rule applicable to the services and corresponding to any of these Rules which is in force

immediately before the commencement of these Rules was repealed.

23. It is the categorical stand of the appellant-State of Haryana that the benefit of relaxation in upper age limit was granted to the candidates seeking employment prior to amendment of the Rules in 2012 as per Departmental Instructions dated 25.06.1981 and 12.2.1982. In other words as per the State the benefit of relaxation in terms of these instructions was available to the candidates when the 1955 Rules and the 1998 Rules were in existence. We have already noticed above, that the 1955 Rules and the 1998 Rules contained provisions for relaxation. Clearly the relaxation granted by these letters/ instructions was permissible as per the provisions of the 1955 Rules and 1998 Rules. In any event there is nothing on record to indicate that these instructions were ever assailed as being not permissible in terms of the said Rules.

24. The case of the appellant-State is that these instructions had not been incorporated in the 2012 Rules and hence could not be relied upon. Also the Government had not relaxed any of the provisions of the Rules with respect to any class or category of persons. We find ourselves unable to agree with this contention for the following among other reasons:

- (i) The instructions dated 25.06.1981 and 12.2.1982 were formally withdrawn only on 14.06.2017. Thus at the time when the petitioners submitted their applications and were selected the instructions were in existence.
- (ii) The case of the State is that the instructions though issued when the 1955 Rules were in existence continued to operate when the 1998

Rules were applicable and have ceased to operate after the 2012 Rules were promulgated as they were not incorporated in the 2012 Rules. Here there is an inconsistency in the stand of the State. The instructions were issued when the 1955 Rules were in operation. By Rule 20 of the 1998 Rules the earlier Rules were repealed. Similarly by Rule 20 of the 2012 Rules the 1998 Rules were repealed. If despite the repeal of the 1955 Rules by the 1998 Rules the instructions continued to exist and the candidates were given the benefit of age relaxation in terms thereof then there is no reason why the instructions would cease to operate after the repeal of the 1998 Rules by the 2012 Rules. The aspirants for these services would have a legitimate expectation that till the time these instructions were not withdrawn the benefit in terms thereof would be available.

- (iii) There is more so as in the 1998 Rules other than the general power of relaxation envisaged in Rule 17 there was no specific provision for relaxation of age prescribed in Rule 5. To the contrary Rule 5 of the 2012 Rules prescribes that the candidate should not be less than eighteen years or more than forty years. But Rule 5 in addition thereto also prescribes “or such age as fixed by the Government from time to time”. Thus, notwithstanding the age specifically prescribed by Rule 5, the Government may fix any different age from time to time. This would enable the Government to fix a different age for different categories as well. The instructions not having been formally withdrawn, it could well be understood by the candidates as a

specific fixation of age in respect of those registered with the employment exchange or a relaxation of requirement of age for such candidates in terms of Rule 17.

(iv) The Application Form that the candidates were to fill contained specific columns regarding the 'Upper Age Relaxation required', 'Whether registered in Employment Exchange before attaining the age of forty years and still name exists as registered unemployed'. If no benefit in terms of instructions was to be given there was no purpose of incorporating such columns in the Application Form.

25. Thus, we find no illegality or infirmity in the judgment of the Ld. Single Judge holding that the petitioners are entitled to the benefit of age relaxation in terms of the Instructions. Accordingly, the appeals are dismissed. The writ petition (CWP-5642-2015) is allowed.

26. Before parting with this judgment we deem it appropriate to state what is very obvious. Public appointments are extremely hard to come by. Years go by before posts are advertised. Thousands and lakhs apply against the few vacancies that are advertised. As candidates advance in age their ability to compete with the candidates fresh from colleges and universities diminishes. The number of educated unemployed persons is enormous and is increasing.

27. The total number of candidates in these bunch of cases is about nineteen only. They have already crossed the age of forty years. This is probably their last chance of getting a government employment. The heaven of a public appointment which they and their families yearned for

all these years came so close with their selection and yet proved elusive. The Application Form containing the columns regarding registration with the employment exchange led them to believe that they were eligible being registered with the employment exchange.

The instructions have now been withdrawn on 14.06.2017. Thus, this is probably the last batch of candidates that would seek the benefit of these instructions.

**(RAJIV SHARMA)
JUDGE**

**(HARINDER SINGH SIDHU)
JUDGE**

November 13 , 2019

gian

Whether Speaking / Reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable	Yes / No