

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

LPA-562-2022 (O&M)

Date of decision: 06.12.2023

Chaudhary Charan Singh Haryana Agricultural University, Hisar and
another

...Appellants

Vs.

Monika and others

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RITU BAHRI, ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY**

Present: Mr. Shreenath A. Khemka, Advocate,
for the appellants.

Mr. R.K. Malik, Senior Advocate,
with Mr. Varun Veer Chauhan, Advocate,
for respondent No.1.

Mr. Deepak Balyan, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

Ritu Bahri, Acting Chief Justice

1. The instant appeal, under Clause X of the Letters Patent Appeal, is against the judgment dated 24.05.2022 passed by the learned Single Judge of this Court, whereby petition (CWP-4402-2020) filed by petitioner-respondent No.1 has been allowed and the respondents (appellants herein) have been directed to consider the petitioner-respondent No.1 for appointment after affording her 0.5 marks for experience.

2. While allowing the petition, learned Single Judge has observed as under:

“The petitioner had furnished experience certificate dated 01.04.2018 (Annexure P-6) wherein it is stated that work of job contract

was allocated to her in the CCS Haryana Agricultural University, Hisar. It is also stated that she had performed her job quite satisfactorily and she had worked from 05.05.2017 to 31.03.2018. Her certificate has been verified and signed by the Professor and Head, Department of Soil Science, CCS HAU, Hisar. The petitioner had admittedly worked in the respondent-University from 05.05.2017 to 31.03.2018, which was for a period of over six months and she would be entitled to 0.5 marks. The respondents cannot deny her this benefit on the ground that she was appointed through outsourcing....”

3. Learned counsel for petitioner-respondent No.1 has referred to the certificate dated 01.04.2018 (Annexure P-6) issued by the Department of Soil Science, CCS HAU, Hisar, wherein it is stated that Ms. Monika (petitioner-respondent No.1) had been working as Clerk-cum-Typist in the appellant-university from 05.05.2017 to 31.03.2018 and her job was found to be satisfactory.

4. The petitioner-respondent No.1 has done the said work for more than six months and that is why, learned Single Judge has allowed the petition filed by her by observing that she is entitled to get 0.5 marks for the experience.

5. Learned counsel for the appellant-university has not been able to cite any case law, on the basis of which, it can be established that the petitioner-respondent No.1 is not entitled to get 0.5 marks on account of the work done by her in the appellant-university.

6. After going through the contents of appeal as well as the impugned judgment, this Court is of the view that the appellant-university has been rightly directed to consider the petitioner-respondent No.1 for appointment by affording her 0.5 marks for the experience. Hence, no ground is made out to interfere in the well reasoned judgment passed by learned Single Judge.

Resultantly, finding no merits, present appeal stands dismissed.

Since the main appeal has been dismissed, all pending misc. application(s) stand disposed of.

(RITU BAHRI)
ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

06.12.2023
ajp

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No