



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

**LPA No.1201 of 2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 28.04.2025**

Rajbir

.....Appellant.

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents.

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA
 HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA**

Present:- Mr. Sunil K. Nehra, Advocate and
 Mr. Rahil Mahajan, Advocate
 for the appellant.

SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA, J.(Oral)

The appellant before us assails the judgment dated 19.03.2025 passed by the learned Single Judge in ***CWP No.16059 of 2023*** titled as '***Rajbir Vs. State of Haryana and others***', whereby the writ petition preferred by the petitioner-appellant was dismissed.

2. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the appellant was not claiming benefit of age relaxation and therefore, though he was a working Teacher, he did not produce the Experience Certificate along-with his Application Form. However, the respondents issued the Examination Notice laying down the selection criteria for written examination and experience, wherein 16 marks for experience were also shown to be included with 02 marks for each completed period of year. The said



Examination Notice was issued on 24.05.2016 before the written examination but there was no opportunity available to the appellant to submit the Experience Certificate at that stage.

3. We, however, notice that the examination was in two parts, written examination and interview. At the stage of interview, the appellant had an opportunity to submit his Experience Certificate which he, admittedly, did not produce. In view thereto, we do not find any reason to give the appellant benefit of experience which he may have gained as a Teacher. Since the said Experience Certificate was not produced before the Examining Authority, the appellant cannot later on claim the benefit of the same. For the afore-said reasons, though different from those which have been considered by the learned Single Judge, we do not find any merit in the case of the appellant even if one post was lying vacant.

4. The present appeal is, accordingly, dismissed.

5. Pending civil misc. application also stands disposed of.

(SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA)
JUDGE

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

April 28, 2025
Yag Dutt

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No