

116IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-116-2022
Date of Decision: 07.01.2022

MEENA KUMARI

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

Present : Mr. Balraj Singh Dhull, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Rajni Gupta, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

ARUN MONGA, J. (ORAL)

Petition herein, under Articles 226/227 of Constitution of India is for issuance of a writ in the nature of *certiorari* quashing the Clarificatory point No.3 in Public Notice dated 22.12.2021 (Annexure P-6) issued by respondent No.2, whereby, the petitioner has been advised to withdraw the marks claimed by her under the head of 'No Family Member in Govt. Job.'

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner, in pursuant to advertisement issued by respondent No.2 on 07.09.2019, had applied for the post of Staff Nurse and passed the written examination. On her being successful in the written examination, she was called for scrutiny of documents. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioner claimed the marks under the head of "No Family Member in Government Job" as none of her family members including mother-in-law or father-in-law were in government service. Learned counsel further submits that the respondents have now issued a Public Notice dated 22.12.2021, whereby, in Clarificatory Point No.3, it has been mentioned that the status of employment of women

candidates' family shall be considered with regard to her family of birth (Biological parents) and not of in-laws, whereas, the same was not clarified in the advertisement issued by respondent No.2.

3. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and gone through the case file.

4. A perusal of sub-clause (iii) of 2.3 i.e Criteria for Selection, Examination and Syllabus of the advertisement shows that 10 marks for socio-economic criteria and experience shall be allocated to the applicant if neither he/she nor any person from among the applicant's family viz. father, mother, spouse, brother, and Son is, was or has been a regular employee in any Department/Board/Corporation/Company/Statutory Body/Commission/Authority of Government of Haryana or any other State Government or Government of India.

5. The respondents have rightly denied the benefit of marks to the petitioner for socio economic criteria as her father was in government job.

6. No grounds to interfere. Dismissed.

January 07, 2022
gurpreet

(ARUN MONGA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No