



CWP-17170-2025

**220 IN THE PUNJAB AND HARYANA HIGH COURT
AT CHANDIGARH**CWP-17170-2025
Decided on:09.06.2025Prabhjeet Singh (minor) through his father & Natural Guardian
.... Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana and another Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPALPresent: Mr. Mandeep Singh Lamba, Advocate with
Mr. Manan Kheterpal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sanjeev Kaushik, Addl. AG, Haryana.

Anil Kshetarpal, J. (Oral)

The petitioner challenges the correctness of Clause 4.1 of advertisement for Common Eligibility Test (hereinafter referred to as 'CET') for Group-C posts, which reads as under:

"Candidate should not be less than 18 years of age as on the closing date and not more than 42 years of age as on the closing date of registration. The Age relaxation to eligible candidates shall be as per Haryana Govt. Instructions No.22/06/2021-1GS-III, Dated 25th March, 2022 (Appendix-D)."

In substance, on the closing date, the petitioner will not complete 18 years of age.

2. This closing date has been prescribed as per policy issued by the State of Haryana for holding CET for Group-C posts.

3. Learned counsel representing the petitioner contends that CET is not a recruitment test and hence, the respondents have arbitrarily provided that the candidates should be minimum 18 years of age on the closing date. He submits that as and when the examination for recruitment is held the minimum age could be prescribed but not for participating in CET.



CWP-17170-2025

4. On the other hand, learned counsel representing the State submits that in order to create a pool of eligible candidates for appearing in the recruitment exam, CET is conducted as per policy of the State wherein it has been provided that the candidate should not be less than 18 years of age as on the closing date of registration. He submits that if the candidates, who are less than 18 years of age, are permitted to appear in the CET, it would create a big problem for the State. He further submits that a conscious policy decision has been taken by the State, which in absence of violation of statutory provision, should not be interfered with.

5. This Court has considered the submissions made by learned counsel representing the parties.

6. The employer is entitled to prescribe the cut off date for appearing in a particular eligibility test, which is a step towards ultimate recruitment under the State Government. The Court is not expected to interfere in a policy decision taken by the State unless it is proved to be totally arbitrary or in violation of statutory or constitutional provision. The policy decisions are taken by the State in exercise of executive powers of the State Government as provided under Article 162 of the Constitution of India. On the closing date, the petitioner will be a minor.

7. In these circumstances, the policy decision of the State is neither proved to be arbitrary nor in violation of statutory provision. Hence, no ground is made out for issuance of directions to the respondents, as prayed for.

8. Accordingly, the present petition stands dismissed.

09.06.2025
sonia

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/non-speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No