

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

214

**CWP-3661-2016 (O&M)
Date of decision: 31.01.2023**

SANGEET

..Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS.

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present: Mr. Puneet Kumar Bansal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gurpreet Singh, Addl.A.G., Punjab.

Mr. Ajaivir Singh, Advocate
for respondent no.4.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J(Oral)

Though, the petitioner was issued an appointment letter, however, subsequently, it was found that she was not eligible to apply for the post of Masters/Mistresses on the contractual basis because her age was more than 37 years as on 01.01.2011. As per the recruitment notice, the maximum age for applying to the post of masters/mistresses on the contractual basis was 37 years as on 01.01.2011.

The learned counsel representing the petitioner submits that as per the instructions dated 08.10.2012, the upper age limit for the direct recruitment has been increased to 38 years and since the petitioner was issued the appointment letter after 08.12.2012, hence, the petitioner should have been appointed.

This court has considered the submissions of the learned counsel representing the petitioner, however, finds no substance therein.

Admittedly, as per the recruitment notice, the maximum age for applying

was 37 years as on 01.01.2011. The candidates accordingly submitted their applications. There may be a large number of persons, who were beyond 37 years of age but did not apply in accordance with the stipulation in the recruitment notice. The petitioner cannot take the benefit of any subsequent change in the upper age limit.

Consequently, finding no merit, the writ petition is dismissed.

All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, are also disposed of.

January 31, 2023
nt

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE

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