



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

111

**CWP-14615-2025 (O&M)
Decided on : 23.05.2025**

NAVITA RANI

..PETITIONER

Versus

DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE ROHTAK AND ANOTHER

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

PRESENT: Ms. Geeta Rani, Advocate and
Mr. Ram Niwas, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ranjit Singh Kalra, Advocate
for respondent No. 1.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI , J. (Oral)

1. In the present petition, the challenge is to the impugned appointment (Annexure P-4) of the respondent No. 2 to the post of Process Server on the ground that the respondent No. 2 has been selected by the respondent-department in preference to the petitioner in the reserved category of person with disability (Low Vision) whereas, in actuality the respondent No.2 does not suffer the said disability.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has applied for the post in question by attaching the certificates of disability of Low Vision whereas, no such disability certificate has been attached by respondent No. 2 while submitting the application form for the post in



CWP-14615-2025 (O&M)

-2-

question, but still respondent No. 2 has been considered and selected for the post in question.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. Ranjit Singh Kalra, Advocate, appears and accepts notice on behalf of respondent No. 1.

5. Learned counsel for respondent No. 1 submits that keeping in view the information received from learned District and Sessions Judge, Rohtak, vide letter dated 22.05.2025, which also bears the disability certificate of respondent No. 2 dated 26.11.2024 issued to him by the competent authority, which makes it clear that respondent No. 2 also suffers the disability of low vision.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner has not been able to dispute the said statement made by learned counsel for the respondents recorded herein above.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the case file with their able assistance.

8. It may be noticed that once, the ground which has been taken by the petitioner to claim that respondent No. 2 was not eligible to compete for the post in question in the category of person with disability (Low Vision) has not been established and rather, the disability certificate issued by competent authority attached by respondent no. 2, shows that he also suffers the disability of low vision, hence, it cannot be said that respondent No. 2 was not eligible to compete or to be selected in the category of person with disability (low vision) for the post in question.

9. Keeping in view the totality of circumstances, the selection of



CWP-14615-2025 (O&M)

-3-

the respondent No. 2 cannot be treated as arbitrary and illegal in any manner hence, no ground is made out for any interference by this Court in the facts and circumstances of the present case.

10 Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

23.05.2025

Riya

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