

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

211

CWP No. 26621 of 2014  
Date of Decision: 03.03.2020

Mohinder Kaur

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab & others

... Respondents

**CORAM:-HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASI**

Present: Mr. Surinder Garg, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Charanpreet Singh, Asstt. A.G., Punjab.

**AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASI, J.**

Petitioner has approached this Court with a grievance that despite a merit list having been prepared of the candidates who had applied under Matric Freedom Fighter Category (Annexure-P3) where the name of the petitioner figured at Serial No. 3, no post has been filled up from the Freedom Fighter Category under the Matric quota. In reply which has been filed by respondents it is stated that there was no post earmarked for the Freedom Fighter Category under Matric quota.

The second contention which has been raised by the petitioner is that she has passed the Gyani and for higher education she was entitled to marks which has also not been granted to her to which the reply as has been filed states that the Diploma Course in the streams of Social Education, Woman and Child Welfare, Health and Education were the only streams where additional marks were to be granted. Since the petitioner did not possess diplomas in any of these categories and Gyani, is not included therein, she was not entitled to. It has further been clarified as per the Communication dated 21.11.2011 (Annexure-R1) that mere possession of Gyani would not be enough. Alongwith Gyani, the candidate has to pass

Oriental Teachers Training examination (OTT) which the petitioner does not possess.

As regards the assertion of the petitioner that the petitioner has passed one year Diploma course in Computer, the response given by the respondent is that the petitioner has obtained the Diploma Certificate from one Digital Group of Institute, which is neither recognized by the State nor by the Union Government and, therefore, she is not entitled the benefit of the said Diploma and thus additional marks could not be assigned to her. Marks secured by the petitioner are 26.45 and she belongs to the Backward Class Category and the last candidate who has been appointed as Supervisor has obtained 27.43 marks. Petitioner being lower in merit in the Backward Class to which she belongs, the claim as made by the petitioner in this writ petition can not be accepted.

In view of the above, finding no merit in present writ petition, the same stands dismissed.

(AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH)  
JUDGE

03.03.2020  
neeraj

|                           |               |
|---------------------------|---------------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No        |
| <i>Whether reportable</i> | <i>Yes/No</i> |