



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

(120)

CWP No. 10087 of 2024
Date of Decision : 16.05.2024

Sonia Bhatt

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. Vikas Chatrath, Advocate with
Ms. Preetleen Kaur, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Vibha Tewari, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana.

Dr. Neha Awasthi, Advocate
for respondent No. 4-HPSC.

Harsimran Singh Sethi J. (Oral)

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that once despite issuance of the statutory rules, certain instructions have been issued by the department granting relaxation qua expenses, the said relaxation have to be adhered to while filling up the post in question.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in the present case, the only claim of the petitioner is that while making the direct recruitment for the post in question, experience should be requisited as per the Instructions, which have been issued by the Government, hence,



the respondents are liable to be directed to consider the claim of the petitioner as to whether, it will be expedient to relax the qualification of experience in terms of the Instructions issued by the Government of Haryana so as to make the petitioner eligible to compete for the post in question.

3. Notice of motion.

4. On the asking of the Court, Ms. Vibha Tewari, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana, who is present in Court, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and Dr. Neha Awasthi, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of respondent No. 4-HPSC.

5. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that in case, any representation is received from the petitioner raising any grievance, the same will be considered in light of the statutory rules as well as the Instructions on the basis of which the present petition has been filed and the appropriate decision will be taken within a period of three weeks from the receipt of any such claim and in case, it is found feasible to grant the claim as raised, the same will be granted, otherwise due reasons will be mentioned for not accepting the claim of the petitioner in the speaking order to be passed, which will be conveyed to the petitioner.

6. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that the earlier rejection order dated 31.10.2023 will not be made the sole reason in rejection of the claim as raised henceforth.



7. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in view of the statement of learned State counsel, the present petition may kindly be disposed of having been not pressed any further with liberty to raise the claim before the authorities concerned.

8. Ordered accordingly.

May 16, 2024
kanchan

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No