

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

129

CWP-7483-2023 (O&M)
Date of decision: 17.04.2023

Manju Nain and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. S.K. Bishnoi, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. R.S. Budhwar, Addl. AG Haryana.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

The petitioners seek issuance of a writ in the nature of Certiorari quashing the impugned order dated 16.09.2022 (Annexure P-9), whereby the respondents withdrew the order dated 06.09.2021 (Annexure P-1) in an arbitrary and illegal manner. A further prayer is made for issuance of a writ in the nature of Mandamus directing the respondents to consider Central Teacher Eligibility Test (CTET) equivalent to the State Teacher Eligibility Test (STET)/Haryana Teacher Eligibility Test (HTET) for all intents and purposes, for the post of Trained Graduate Teacher (TGT) and allow the petitioners to participate in the selection process, provisionally.

At the outset, learned State counsel submits that the issue involved in the present case is similar to the one contained in CWP-5864-2023 titled as 'Annu Vs. State of Haryana and others', which has already

been dismissed by this Court vide a detailed order dated 21.03.2023 and prays for dismissal of the present petition in the same terms.

Learned State counsel further relies upon an order dated 12.04.2023 passed by a Division Bench of this Court, in CM-5659-CWP-2023 in CWP-5090-2023 (Luxmi Devi and others Vs. State of Haryana and others). In the said petition, challenge is to the Haryana School Education (Group-C) State Cadre Service Rules, 2012, prescribing the qualification of Haryana Teacher Eligibility Test (HTET)/School Teacher Eligibility Test (STET) for the purpose of appointment to the post of Post Graduate Teachers in various streams. He specifically makes a reference to the fact that the Hon’ble Division Bench vide the aforesaid order dated 12.04.2023, has declined to grant any interim relief to the petitioners therein by observing that unless their challenge to the Rules is adjudicated, it may not be possible to grant any interim relief to them.

In view of the judgment of this Court in Annu’s case (supra) and the order dated 12.04.2023 passed by the Division Bench in Luxmi Devi’s case (supra), the present petition is dismissed.

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

17.04.2023

Mangal Singh

Whether reasoned/speaking?	Yes/No
Whether reportable?	Yes/No