

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

CWP-11555-2018 (O&M)

Date of decision: March 22, 2022

Satbir Saini

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

Present: Mr. Ravinder Kumar Bangar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Saurabh Mohunta, DAG Haryana.

ARUN MONGA, J. (ORAL)

Petition herein, *inter alia*, is for issuance of a writ in the nature of Certiorari for quashing the impugned order dated 03.05.2018 (Annexure P-8) passed by respondent No.3 whereby representation dated 11.09.2017 (Annexure P-3) of the petitioner regarding considering him eligible for the post of Tracer against Advertisement No.7/2015, Cat No.02 has been rejected.

2. Petitioner pleads that pursuant to an advertisement dated 10.07.2015, he had applied for the post of Tracer under the category of ESM-BCB. He submits that after the declaration of the result, date for scrutiny of documents was fixed as 30.08.2017 and the petitioner appeared for the same as well along with all the requisite documents except one certificate of Engineering and Drawing. Later on, petitioner submitted the said certificate dated 12.12.2014 along with his representation dated 11.09.2017. The Commission had also afforded two more opportunities to those candidates who were earlier absent at the time of scrutiny of documents. But the petitioner was not shown in the final list dated 26.04.2018 and his representation was also not considered.

3. While on the other hand, learned State counsel appears and opposes the petition, relying on the reply filed in response thereto.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

5. Vide Annexure P-7, the eligibility condition *qua* the educational qualification is as below:-

“i) Matriculation or school leaving certificate examination of a recognized university or Board or its equivalent with drawing as a subject or experience in tracing work; and

ii) Hindi/Sanskrit upto Matric Standard or higher education.”

6. As against the aforesaid, petitioner appended his matriculation certificate but *qua* the experience in tracing work, nothing was put forth either before this Court or before the respondents while applying for the post in question. A perusal of the matriculation certificate reflects that concededly petitioner did not have drawing as a subject in the matriculation. It was in this premise, following reasoning has been given vide impugned order:-

“The application and attached documents have been again gone through by Commission. As per documents attached with the application form at the time of scrutiny on 30.08.2017 Sh. Satbir Singh has attached Matriculation Certificate issued by Board of School Education, Haryana on 22 May 1990, Senior Secondary Certificate issued by Board of School Education, Haryana on 06 December 1993 and Graduation Certificate from Indian Air Force in which drawing subject is not mentioned. In addition to these he has not submitted any documents in support of having drawing as a subject or experience in tracing work, whereas, the essential qualification for the said post is Matriculation or School leaving certificate examination of a recognized university or Board or its equivalent with drawing as a subject or experience in tracing work.”

7. Perusal of the impugned order and record appended with the writ petition do not warrant any interference. The candidature of the petitioner has rightly been rejected as he has admittedly neither done his matriculation with drawing as a subject nor has he appended any proof of having experience in the

tracing work. The advertisement is not under challenge. No grounds for interference are made out. Dismissed.

(ARUN MONGA)
JUDGE

March 22, 2022
mahavir

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No