



CWP-4931-2021

1

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

209

CWP-4931-2021

Date of decision: 10.01.2025

Sumanpreet Kaur

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY**

\*\*\*\*\*

Present : Mr. Navjot Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sehajbir Singh Aulakh, AAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*\*\*

**AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (Oral)**

1. Prayer made in the present petition is for directing the respondents to consider the case of the petitioner for appointment to the post of Junior Coach (Rifle shooting category No.5).

2. The petitioner applied in the year 2012 pursuant to Advertisement No.3/2012 dated 05.07.2012. As per the criteria, the selections were to be made based on the percentage of marks obtained in technical qualification. Admittedly, she in her BPED secured 74.64%. In the rifle category, there were 3 posts against which 2 candidates, who were appointed, had 73.25% and 63% marks, respectively. One post remained vacant, as is apparent from the RTI information dated 27.10.2020, Annexure P-7.

3. The primary ground taken by the respondent for not offering appointment to the petitioner was that she did not appear in the counselling that took place from 14.12.2015 to 23.12.2015, which was scheduled after publication of a notice in a leading newspaper of the region on 05.12.2015 and also on the Board's website on 08.12.2015 alongwith game wise list of candidates including her name.

4. Reference on behalf of the petitioner is made to Clause 12 of the Advertisement, which reads thus:-



“12. That the candidate have to write the name of the post on the envelope and have to attach two registered envelopes alongwith postal tickets with the envelope. The applicant have to enclose the same for the purpose of letter correspondence.”

5. As is apparent from the application form, Annexure P-2 that the petitioner was a resident of Village Gurusar 2W, Shri Ganga Nagar, Rajasthan and it is not the case of the respondents that any communication was sent to her in terms of the aforesaid clause other than the public notice, admittedly published only in a regional newspaper, there being nothing produced on record to show its circulation in the above State and ergo gravely prejudiced his cause.

6. It is evident that the authorities failed to follow the procedure of communication as envisaged in the advertisement, moreover, the selection process initiated way back in the year 2012, counselling for which having been scheduled 3 years thereafter, it cannot be said to be reasonable and was a tall order to expect a candidate to continue to visit the website of the Board as well. As such, the petitioner, although meritorious, was left in the lurch without being at fault.

7. As a fall out and consequence of the afore-discussion, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondents to consider the case of the petitioner for appointment as per the merit determined by the Board against the post which this Court on 24.03.2021 had ordered to be kept vacant. Needful be done within a period of two months.

**(AMAN CHAUDHARY)**  
**JUDGE**

**10.01.2025**

Hemant

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