

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

205

**CWP-28429-2018 (O&M)
Date of Order:26.02.2021**

RAVINDER SINGH

..Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present: Mr. Sunil Kumar Nehra, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Kirti Singh, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J(Oral)

The hearing of the case was held through video conferencing on account of restricted functioning of the Courts.

Since this Court is of the view that the petitioner is required to be relegated to the alternative remedy, therefore, it is not considered appropriate to note the facts in detail. However, for the purpose of disposal of this writ petition, some facts are being noticed.

The petitioner applied under the category of dependent of ex-servicemen pursuant to a recruitment notice issued by the State of Haryana for appointing Trained Graduate Teachers. As per the petitioner, 10 posts of TGT (Science) were reserved for dependents of ex-servicemen in the cadre of Rest of Haryana, whereas, 14 posts were reserved in the exclusive cadre for the area of Mewat. The petitioner claims that against the 10 posts only 7 have been appointed, whereas against the 14 posts in Mewat, 11 have been filled up by the general category candidates.

On notice of motion, the written statement has been filed and it has been pleaded that the petitioner did not produce the proof of his being dependent of ex-servicemen and hence, his candidature was rejected.

Learned counsel for the respondent draws the attention of the Court to the attendance sheet prepared at the time of interview which has been signed by the petitioner on 26.09.2018. In the remarks column of the attendance sheet, the petitioner has been described as ineligible as he did not produce the proof to prove that he was dependent of an ex-servicemen. Learned counsel for the respondent further contends that even at the time of scrutiny of documents, the petitioner did not produce the certificate of being a dependent of an ex-servicemen. She further draws the attention of the Court to a copy of eligibility register Annexure P-13 and submits that there is a doubt about the genuineness of the eligibility certificate as the date of the application has been mentioned as 24.07.2002, whereas, the certificate is alleged to have been issued in 2006. She draws the attention of the Court to Clause 7 of the eligibility certificate which provides that such certificate is valid only for one year.

Keeping in view the aforesaid facts, it is apparent that the disputed questions of facts are involved which are required to be proved by the parties after leading evidence.

Hence, the petitioner is relegated to the alternative remedy.

The present writ petition is disposed of accordingly.

February 26, 2021
nt

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

: Yes/No
: Yes/No