

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

202

CWP-24364-2011

Date of decision : 03.08.2022

Ajaib Singh and others

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.. Respondents

CORAM :HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL

Present:- Mr. G.L. Bajaj, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. T.P.S. Chawla, DAG, Punjab.

Ms. Sukhmani Patwalia, Advocate for respondents No.3 and 4.

Anupinder Singh Grewal, J. (Oral)

The petitioners have challenged the advertisement dated 07.12.2010 (Annexure P-34) for recruitment to the post of Lineman.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that in the impugned advertisement, the upper age limit of 37 years has been prescribed which would render the petitioners overage, who are working on contractual basis with the respondents/PSPCL. He also submits that the petitioners had earlier approached this Court by way of filing several writ petitions including CWP No.9309 of 2011, which was disposed of on 25.08.2011, directing the respondents to consider and decide the representations of the petitioners. The representations of the petitioners have been rejected on 09.11.2011 (Annexure P-44) by passing a non-speaking order.

Learned counsel for respondents No.3 and 4, while relying on the reply, submits that the age limit which was prescribed in the advertisement was 37 years and later in pursuance to the orders of this Court, it was relaxed to 39 years. She also submits that the recruitment has already been finalized.

Heard.

The petitioners, who were stated to be working as Linemen on contractual basis with the respondent/PSPCL, are seeking relaxation in the upper age limit upto 45 years in the advertisement. The upper age limit was 37 years which had been extended to 39 years in terms of the order of this Court. The case of the petitioners had been considered and rejected by the respondent by order dated 09.11.2011 (Annexure P-44) on the ground that the duties of the Linemen are arduous in nature and they have to climb up the electric poles/towers to maintain electric supply and if the upper age limit is relaxed to 45 years in the case of the petitioners, who are from the general category, then the age limit will have to be 50-55 years for reserved category candidates. I am in agreement with the reasoning furnished by the respondents in rejecting the case of the petitioners for further relaxation in the recruitment. It is entirely upto the recruitment agency to prescribe the age limit. The age limit as prescribed cannot be said to be unreasonable. The advertisement was issued in the year 2010 and the recruitment has already been made. It would also be unjust to disturb the appointments already made at this stage.

Consequently, I do not find any merit in this petition which stands dismissed.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

August 03, 2022
sonia gugnani

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