



CWP-21912-2020 (O&M)

1

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

Sr. No.212**CWP-21912-2020 (O&M)****Date of decision: 19.11.2025**

Dr. Rajinder Kaur

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPINDER SINGH NALWA

Present: Mr. Vivek Sharma, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Charanpreet Singh, AAG, Punjab.

DEEPINDER SINGH NALWA, J.(Oral)

1 In the present writ petition, the petitioner is praying for issuance of direction to the respondents to produce the result of selection of Guest Faculty Lecturers (Punjabi) commenced by them in pursuance to the advertisement and interview conducted on 19.09.2019 vide which respondent No.4 has been appointed. In the petition, the appointment of respondent No.4 has also been challenged on the ground that as the petitioner is higher in merit, then respondent No.4, as such, respondent No.4 was not entitled to be considered for appointment on the post of Guest Faculty Lecturer (Punjabi).

2. Brief facts of the case are that respondent No.3-college issued an advertisement for filling up of various posts of Guest Faculty Lecturers in the year 2019. One post of Guest Faculty Lecturer in the subject of



Punjabi was also advertised. In pursuance to the abovesaid advertisement, the petitioner applied for the post of Guest Faculty Lecturer (Punjabi). Interview was held on 19.09.2019. As per the petitioner, respondent No.3-college without declaring the result has appointed respondent No.4 on the post of Guest Faculty Lecturer (Punjabi). The petitioner filed a detailed representation dated 27.09.2019 (Annexure P-4) before respondent No.3 for consideration of her case for appointment in question. Thereafter, the petitioner submitted an application under the Right to Information Act, 2005 on 15.10.2019 asking for the result. The necessary information was supplied vide reply dated 15.11.2019 (Annexure P-5). As per the petitioner, she had secured higher marks than the marks secured by respondent No.4 and as such, she was entitled to be considered for appointment on the post of Guest Faculty Lecturer (Punjabi). The petitioner submitted various representations, but the case of the petitioner was not considered for the post in question. As a consequence of this, the petitioner has filed the present writ petition.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that as the petitioner has secured more marks than respondent No.4, she was entitled to be considered for appointment on the post of Guest Faculty Lecturer (Punjabi). It is also the case of the petitioner that as the petitioner was already in service, age relaxation should have been given to



her and as such, the petitioner was eligible for consideration for appointment on the post of Guest Faculty Lecturer (Punjabi).

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3-State submits that although, there is no dispute that the petitioner is higher in merit, however, she was not eligible for the reason that at the time of submission of her application form, the petitioner was more than 37 years. As per the government gazette notification, maximum age limit in order to become eligible for the purpose of appointment for the post of Guest Faculty Lecturer (Punjabi), maximum age is 37 years in the category of direct recruitment. As the petitioner was more than 38 years at the time of consideration for appointment, she was held to be ineligible for consideration on the post in question.

5. I have heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the parties at length.

6. A perusal of the facts of the case would show that the petitioner has been held ineligible for consideration for appointment on the post of Guest Faculty Lecturer (Punjabi) on the ground that the petitioner was over age i.e. she has crossed the upper age limit of 37 years at the time of submission of application form. It is an admitted fact that as per the gazette notification issued by the Government of Punjab, in order to become eligible for appointment by way of direct recruitment, the maximum age limit is 37 years for the purpose of appointment. As the



petitioner was more than 37 years, she was rightly held not eligible for consideration for appointment on the post of in question. In regard to contention raised by learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner that the petitioner was already in service and relaxation of age should have been given to her, no instructions/rule was brought to the notice of this Court whereby, an employee who is already in service, is entitled for relaxation of age. Infact, as per the Punjab Gazette Notification dated 25.01.2013 issued by the Government of Punjab, the relaxation of age in only permissible in the case of person belonging to Scheduled Caste category.

7. In view of above, this Court finds no merit in the present writ petition and the same is dismissed.

8. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, also stands disposed of.

(DEEPINDER SINGH NALWA)
JUDGE

19.11.2025
Ramandeep Singh

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