

283

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-1016-1997 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 21.11.2023

Surinder Kaur

. . . . Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

. . . . Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA

Present None for the petitioner.

Mr. D.K. Singal, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA, J.(Oral)

1. The petitioner by way of this writ petition has prayed as under:

“Petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a writ of Mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction to allow the petitioner a right of consideration for promotion to the Mistress Cadre as per selection made by the authorities vide Annexure P-2; to stay the further promotions from JBT cadre during the pendency of the writ petition; to give the number of posts of Master/Mistress cadre pertaining to 25 per cent quota meant for JBT cadre for promotion, along with the number of posts filled and those remaining unfilled; to raise the promotion quota from 25 to 50 per cent; to declare the split up of 10 per cent for C and V (craft and vocational) category as invalid; to call for the records; to allow the costs of the petition; to grant any other relief found just and proper for the ends of justice.”

2. The selection process for promotion was initiated in the year 1996 from JBT cadre to Masters cadre. No reply has come forward from the respondents. It appears that the petitioner has also not taken any steps for getting the matter listed after the same was admitted on 08.08.1997. More than twenty-six years have passed by.

3. In view of above, this Court finds that the channel of promotion available is based on merit taking into consideration the seniority, and the consideration of the persons for promotion is with respect to the JBT teachers who possess qualifications as mentioned in the direction dated 09.07.1996 i.e. teachers who are B.Sc/B.Ed and whose date of regular appointment is up to 31.12.1992.
4. Thus, there is a rule of consideration laid down by the authorities which does not call for any intervention. No arguments have been addressed on behalf of the petitioner.
5. Writ Petition stands *dismissed*.
6. All pending applications also stand disposed of accordingly.

(SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA)
JUDGE

November 21, 2023

Mohit goyal

- | | |
|-------------------------------|--------|
| 1. Whether speaking/reasoned? | Yes/No |
| 2. Whether reportable? | Yes/No |