

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

**CWP No.18879-2020 (O&M)**

**Date of Decision:01.04.2021**

Ramandeep Kaur

..... Petitioner

Versus

Union of India and Ors.

..... Respondents

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL**

Present: Mr. Aman Dhir, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sunil Kumar Sharma, Advocate  
for the respondents.

\*\*\*

**ANIL KSHETARPAL, J.(Oral)**

On 09<sup>th</sup> November 2020, the following order was passed:

*“Hearing of the case was held through video conference on account of restricted functioning of the Courts. inter-alia, learned counsel for the petitioner contends that no doubt, in the application form submitted by the petitioner, the District of Domicile was wrongly mentioned as Mansa in place of Bathinda, however, postal PIN Code was correctly written. He further draws the attention of the Court to column No.25, wherein the petitioner has specified the Village and Post Office Virk Khurd, Tehsil Bathinda. He further contends that subsequently, the petitioner had informed the authorities about the inadvertent error and had requested for correction.*

*Learned counsel further contends that the petitioner was disqualified on the ground that she has defective colour vision. He further submits that the petitioner was granted opportunity to file an appeal which was duly filed. However, the same has been rejected only on the ground that the district of domicile does not match with the documents produced by her. He submits, while drawing attention of the Court to Note-III of the Advertisement on page 28, that the petitioner did not submit*

*the application under a particular district quota, rather she applied under a State quota.*

*Notice of motion for 14.12.2020.*

*On the request of this Court, Mr. Sunil Kumar Sharma, Advocate, accepts notice on behalf of the Union of India and prays for some time to file reply.*

*Reply, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing with copy in advance to counsel for the petitioner”.*

Learned counsel appearing for the respondents fairly submits that the appeal filed by the petitioner shall be decided on merits after ignoring the aforesaid technical objections.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in view of the stand taken by the respondents, let the writ petition be disposed of by requesting the respondent No.4 to decide the appeal within a specified time.

In view thereof, the present writ petition is disposed of by requesting respondent No.4 to decide the appeal filed by the petitioner positively within a period of six weeks.

**(ANIL KSHETARPAL)  
JUDGE**

**1<sup>st</sup> April 2021**

*manju*

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