

2024:PHHC:035325
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

569 CWP-1206-2002 (O&M)
Date of decision: 12.03.2024

Nisha Kaura ..Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others ..Respondents

CWP-7109-2002 (O&M)

Upinder Kaur ..Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others ..Respondents

CWP-1667-2002 (O&M)

Munila Arora ..Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others ..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present: Ms. Aruna Sachdeva, Advocate
for the petitioner in CWP-1667 & 1206-2002.
None for the petitioner in CWP-7109-2002.
Mr. Nirmal Singh, Advocate
for respondent No.4 in CWP-1206-2002.

Mr. Akshit Pathania, Advocate for
Mr. BS Patwalia, Advocate for respondent No.5
in CWP-1206-2002.

Ms. Alka Chatrath, Advocate and
Ms. Divyajyot Mann, Advocate for respondent No.5
in CWP-1667-2002.

Mr. Gagneshwar Walia, Addl. AG, Punjab.

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J

1. The prayer made in these Civil Writ Petitions filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, is regarding not considering the petitioners for appointment to the post of Science Mistresses (Medical).

3. On 07.03.2024, this Court had passed the following order:-

“Learned counsel for respondent No.5 in CWP-1667-2002 submits that the cut-off marks for the post of Science Mistress (Medical) in general category was 62.01 whereas, even if the petitioner is granted 1.5 marks for experience, still her marks would be 58.99.

Learned counsel for respondent No.5 in CWP-1206-2002 submits that the cut-off marks was 62.01 and the claim of the petitioner is that she had secured 52.08 marks and was granted only 2 marks for the interview whereas, she was entitled to 10 marks and as such would be qualified. He refers to the judgments of this Court in **Raj Kishore Sharma and others vs. State of Punjab and others, 1993(4) SLR** and **Parkash Singh Lamme and others vs. The State of Punjab and others, 1995(5) SLR**.

Adjourned to 12.03.2024.

A photocopy of this order be placed on the files of connected cases.”

4. In CWP-7109-2002, as per reply filed, the marks secured by the last selected candidate in SC (R) category was 55.12, whereas the petitioner secured 50.23 marks and thus, being lower in merit, was not given appointment.

5. Moreover, the candidates, who have been selected, were not made party.

6. In view of the aforesaid, nothing substantive survives in the present petitions and as such, the same stand disposed of. However, reserving the petitioners a liberty to get the same revived, if need arises.

7. Photocopy of this order be placed on the connected cases.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

12.03.2024

ashok

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No