



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

LPA No.66 of 2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 18.03.2025

Dr. Monika Sachdeva

.....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. Vivek Aggarwal, Advocate
 for the appellant.

SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA, J.(Oral)

Apart from the fact that the present Letters Patent Appeal is suffering from delay and laches of 151 days in re-filing, which we would have ordinarily condoned but we find that on merits also, the appellant-writ petitioner has not been able to satisfy us for interfering with the well-reasoned order dated 23.04.2024 in ***CWP No.8826 of 2019*** titled as '***Dr. Monika Sachdeva Vs. State of Haryana and others***' passed by the learned Single Judge, which she impugns in the present appeal.

2. The main contention of learned counsel for the appellant is that the private respondents were not having the qualification of graduation in Home Science or Child Development or Nutrition but still they have been selected while the appellant was a graduate with Home Science but



has not been selected in the selections which were advertised on 19.03.2011 for the post of Female Supervisor.

3. Learned counsel has invited our attention to the Application Forms to suggest that even some candidates were not possessing graduation degree, however, on careful examination of their Application Forms, we find that all the private respondents possess the degree qualifications and are graduate in various fields.

4. So far as the contention of the appellant with regard to the requisite qualification of graduate in Home Science or Child Development or Nutrition, we find that the advertisement specifically mentions qualifications of graduate from a recognized University. It, of course, mentions that the preference would be given to the candidates, who are graduates in Home Science or Child Development or Nutrition. Though the preference would come at the stage after the candidates have been finally selected and amongst them, there is a candidate having a preferential qualification who would be preferred for appointment. However, we further find that the appellant could not fare well in the selection process and failed to achieve the cut-off marks which has been specifically mentioned in the reply filed by respondents No.2 and 3 along-with their affidavit which reflects that the appellant had secured only 39.12 marks while the final cut-off was 50.53 marks for general category and even the waiting list cut-off was 45.11 marks.

5. In these circumstances, we do not find any reason to interfere with the impugned order passed by the learned Single Judge. The present



appeal is, accordingly, dismissed.

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

(SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA)
JUDGE

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

March 18, 2025

Yag Dutt

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No