

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-1431-2020 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 20.1.2020

Pushpa Rani

--Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab & another

--Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.

Present:- Mr. Rajesh Kumar, Advocate for the petitioner.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.J (Oral)

Petitioner seeks a Mandamus for issuance of directions to the second respondent i.e. D.G.P.-cum-Commandant General of Home Guards to take a decision on a representation dated 19.6.2017 at Annexure P-1.

This Court has perused the representation dated 19.6.2017 and as per which at the time of recruitment of the petitioner under the Punjab Home Guards, Ludhiana in the year 1987 the date of birth was actually 30.6.1963 as mentioned in the school certificate, whereas a mistake has been committed by the department and by way of overwriting/cutting the date of birth has been altered to 30.6.1961. As per the representation submitted in the year 2017 the retirement age of the petitioner ought to be 30.6.2021.

Having heard counsel at length, this Court is of the considered view that the instant writ petition is wholly misconceived.

Counsel was repeatedly called upon to apprise this Court as regards the date of birth that had been mentioned in the application at the stage of entry into service in the year 1987 as also the document that had been furnished at that point of time in support of date of birth.

The response has been completely evasive. Counsel submits that he is not aware of the precise date of birth that had been mentioned in the application seeking appointment to the post of Home Guard. He is not even aware of the document furnished at the time of entry into service in support of his contention that the date of birth of the petitioner is 30.6.1963.

Under such circumstances, the plea raised on behalf of the petitioner as regards a mistake having been committed by the department has gone unsubstantiated.

It would be apposite to take note that the petitioner already stands retired on 30.6.2019.

The prayer raised in the instant petition post retirement can only be seen as an after thought.

No interference in the matter is warranted.

Petition is dismissed.

(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE

20.1.2020

lucky

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