



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

211

CWP-22264-2018

Date of Decision: 17.09.2025

Sheelu

....Petitioner

Versus

Central Administrative Tribunal, Chandigarh and others

....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS SURI**

Present: Mr. R.K.Doon, Advocate and
Mr. Ram Niwas, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Anita Balyan, Advocate
for respondents No.2 and 3.

Mr. Ashok Arora, Advocate
for respondent No.4.

Harsimran Singh Sethi, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed challenging the order dated 07.08.2018 (Annexure P-6) passed by the Central Administrative Tribunal, Chandigarh Bench, Chandigarh, (for short, 'the Tribunal'), whereby the Original Application preferred by the petitioner against the appointment of respondent No.4 to the post of Fieldman in pursuant to the advertisement dated 24.05.2015 (Annexure A-2) was dismissed.

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the petitioner was more meritorious than respondent No.4 but was wrongly ousted from consideration by treating him ineligible on the ground of non production of proof of essential qualification, namely one year's



experience of working in an agricultural farm. It is argued that the documents already placed on record particularly the experience certificate issued by Durga Security Services Private Limited were not appreciated in correct perspective by the Tribunal.

3. Per contra, learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent No.4 submits that the petitioner failed to produce an authentic experience certificate from the competent authority of the Central State Farm, Hisar and hence, did not satisfy the eligibility criteria. Therefore, respondent No.4 being the most meritorious among eligible candidates, was rightly appointed.

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

5. The essential requirement for the post of Fieldman work require the candidate to be matriculate with the certificate of training course in agriculture at a recognized institute followed by one year's experience of work at an agriculture farm or Matric with three years experience of work in Agriculture Cooperation at an agricultural Farm preferably in Government/Semi Government/Corporation.

6. In order to prove his experience, the petitioner has relied upon certificates issued by Durga Security Services Private Limited dated 11.05.2015 and 13.05.2015 claiming that he worked at Central State Farm, Hisar, for about three and half years. However, there is no appointment order, posting order, or an experience certificate issued by the competent authority of the Central State Farm, Hissar itself. The certificate relied upon was issued only by an outsourcing agency, which is not an agricultural institution and cannot certify the nature of agricultural work allegedly performed by the



CWP-22264-2018

-: 3 :-

petitioner.

7. Further, this Court in exercise of jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India does not sit as an appellate authority over the findings of fact recorded by the Tribunal unless they are perverse, arbitrary or contrary to the law (*Union of India and others vs. P.Gunasekaran*, (2015) 2 SCC 610). In the present case, the Tribunal has correctly appreciated the material on record and found the petitioner ineligible. No perversity, illegality, or violation of principles of natural justice is made out.

8. In view of the above discussion and settled principle of service law, as the petitioner, admittedly failed to produce an experience certificate issued by the agricultural farm itself or a competent authority, the rejection of her candidature cannot be said to be arbitrary or illegal, Respondent No.4 being the most meritorious eligible candidate, was rightly appointed.

9. 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.

11. Pending application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

(VIKAS SURI)
JUDGE

September 17, 2025

Varinder

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : No