

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

CWP-24316-2022 (O&M)

Date of decision: November 29, 2022

Jogender Singh

....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

Present:- Ms. Varuna Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Pankaj Middha, Additional AG Haryana.

ARUN MONGA, J. (ORAL)

Petition herein, *inter alia*, is for issuance of a writ in the nature of Certiorari seeking to quash selection of respondent No.4, namely Dr. Krishan Kumar on the post of Director, Haryana Institute of Rural Development. Further writ of Mandamus has been sought seeking direction to official respondents to consider the case of the petitioner for appointment on the said post.

2. Pledged case is that pursuant to advertisement dated 05.03.2021 (Annexure P-1), petitioner applied for the post of Director, Haryana Institute of Rural Development (HIRD). As per RTI information, total 14 applications were received for the post in question. Four candidates, including petitioner, were found suitable for interview by the Executive Committee of HIRD. Petitioner was called for interview vide letter dated 21.03.2022 (Annexure P-6). As per the marks given by the Executive Committee, Dr. Krishan Kumar-respondent No.4 scored the maximum and his name was consequently

recommended for the post in question. Earlier, upon scrutinizing the application forms, said Krishan Kumar was declared not qualified for the aforesaid post as his age exceeded the maximum age criteria of 50 years.

3. I have heard rival contentions of learned counsel for the parties and gone through the record.

4. Petitioner having remained unsuccessful in the selection process and having once acquiesced to the criteria adopted by the selection committee, is before this Court impugning not only the entire selection process, but also in particular selection of respondent No.4, *inter alia*, on the allegations of his being ineligible as on the cut-off date being overage.

5. Perusal of the writ petition reflects that not only is there no supporting material *qua* the allegations made in the petition, but even otherwise, it appears on the basis of petitioner's roving enquiries, he is indulging in some sort of fishing expedition by seeking indulgence of this Court to explore the truth, of which petitioner himself has no clue.

6. On advance service, learned State counsel appears and *qua* allegations of respondent No.4 being ineligible, has tendered a photocopy of his matriculation certificate, which is taken on record and marked as Annexure 'A'. Said certificate clearly reflects date of birth of respondent No.4 as 20.09.1973, which as per learned State counsel shows that at the time of applying for the job in question, he was 47-year old and as on the date of joining, he was 48 years, as against the upper limit of 50 years as on the cut-off date.

7. In the premise, no grounds for interference are made out.

Dismissed.

8. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(ARUN MONGA)
JUDGE

November 29, 2022
mahavir

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No