

CWP-7574-1999 (O&M)

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

203

CWP-7574-1999 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 01.02.2024

Anita

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present:- None for the petitioner

Mr. Rohit Arya, DAG, Haryana

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J. (Oral)

This petition has been filed, *inter alia*, seeking a writ of *certiorari* quashing the order/letter dated 11.03.1999, Annexure P-7, whereby the petitioner's candidature for the post of Lecturer Sanskrit (Female) under advertisement no.6 of 1997 was rejected.

2. A perusal of impugned letter, dated 11.03.1999, shows that the petitioner's application for the post of Sanskrit Lecturer, School Cadre, was rejected on four counts, non-fulfilment of requisite qualification, being overage, the application form being signed, and no fee having been deposited.

3. Learned State counsel contends that the entire petition has been filed with the averments that the petitioner's candidature has been wrongly rejected being overage, whereas that is only one of the grounds of rejection.

There is no averment, nor any material has been placed on record to show as to how rejection of her candidature on other counts was wrong.

4. He further contends that recruitment for the post in question was regulated by the Haryana State Education (School and Inspection Cadre) (Group B) Service Rules, 1998, wherein maximum age limit for candidates to be eligible for the post has been prescribed as thirty-five years. There is no provision for relaxation of this age limit. Undisputedly, the petitioner was more than thirty-five years of age on the cut-off date, 21.01.1998. Therefore, her candidature was rightly rejected.

5. The stand of the respondents has not been controverted by filing any counter affidavit. Besides, as on date the petitioner would even have crossed the age of superannuation for the post in question. Therefore, no cause survives to her.

6. Accordingly, the petition stands dismissed.

7. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stand(s) disposed of as having been rendered infructuous.

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE

01.02.2024
Payal

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>