

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

133

CWP No. 3102 of 2023 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 15.02.2023

Harpreet Kaur

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL**

**Present:** Ms. Sonia G. Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. D.K.Singal, Addl. A.G, Punjab assisted by  
Mr. Ashok Gupta, Sr. Asst. in the office of  
Director Education Recruitment Board.

\*\*\*\*

**ANIL KSHETARPAL, J. (ORAL)**

1. The petitioner prays for quashing the provisional select list of Science Master Cadre prepared on 16.12.2022. In substance, the petitioner claims that though she passed her qualifying exam before the last date of application pursuant to the recruitment notice, however, her original certificate was not available with her on the last date of submission of application. She claims that her candidature has wrongly been rejected because the certificate of B.Ed course which she completed before the last date was issued after the last date for submitting application pursuant to the recruitment notice.

2. Though, the learned counsel representing the petitioner has not produced a complete translation of the recruitment notice, however, on a Court question, she has read an important note from its vernacular copy. According to the translated version, the said Clause requires the candidates to produce all the relevant certificates which were issued prior to

Education, Recruitment Board has informed the Court that the aforesaid last date was extended on 15.05.2022 whereas the petitioner has been issued her certificate of qualifying the B.Ed course on 10.10.2022. The learned State counsel has informed the Court that the petitioner did not produce her marks sheet relating to B.Ed course during the scrutiny of her documents.

3. Learned counsel representing the petitioner contends that the petitioner had already produced the detailed marks sheets before the concerned authority for scrutiny. Hence, her candidature has wrongly been rejected by the appointing authority.

4. This Court has considered the submission of the learned counsel representing the petitioner, however, expresses its inability to accept the same. The conditions noted in the recruitment notice are required to be adhered to in a strict manner. It is not, ordinarily, permitted to make any deviation from the rules laid down for the recruitment. The petitioner may have a substantive case, however, it is a well settled rule that the documents received after the last date, unless so provided in the recruitment notice, cannot ordinarily be entertained by the appointing authority notwithstanding the exception, if any exist in the case.

5. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts and discussion, no ground is made out to issue the writ. Hence, the present writ petition is dismissed.

**15.02.2023**

Rajeev (rvs)

**(ANIL KSHETARPAL)****JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes

Whether reportable

No