



CWP-25492-2021

1

111+246

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

**CWP-25492-2021 (O&M)
Date of Decision:07.04.2025**

GURMEET SINGH

..... Petitioner

*Versus***STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS**

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present: Mr. Jasbir Mor, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Raman Sharma, Addl. AG, Haryana.

Mr. Gagandeep Singh, Advocate for
Mr. J.S. Saneta, Advocate
for respondents No.4 to 6.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the constitution of India is seeking direction to respondent to award him 5 marks under Socio Economic Criteria.

2. The petitioner applied for the post of Sub-Inspector under General Category. The application was filed pursuant to advertisement No.3/2021 dated 15.06.2021. The said advertisement was issued in continuation of advertisement No.6/2019. In the advertisement No.3/2021 dated 15.06.2021, it was specifically provided that the candidates who had earlier applied will also be eligible against the re-advertised post. They would be granted one time age relaxation.

3. The maximum age prescribed in the advertisement



CWP-25492-2021

2

No.3/2021 dated 15.06.2021 was 27 years and petitioner was more than 27 years as per said advertisement, however, he was less than 27 years as per advertisement No.6/2019. As per terms and conditions of advertisement on No.3/2021 dated 15.06.2021, he was entitled to age relaxation. The respondent has rejected his candidature on the sole ground that he was more than 27 years on 01.06.2021 i.e. cut off date.

4. Mr. Raman Sharma, Addl. AG, Haryana expressed his inability to controvert the fact that candidate who had applied pursuant to advertisement No.6/2019 were entitled to age relaxation while applying against advertisement No.3/2021 dated 15.06.2021. As the respondent has not considered age of petitioner in 2019 whereas as per terms and conditions of advertisement No.3/2021 dated 15.06.2021, the candidate who had applied against the advertisement No.6/2021 were eligible to age relaxation, this Court finds it appropriate to direct the respondent to re-consider claim of the petitioner. The claim of the petitioner would be re-considered in toto.

5. Disposed of.

6. Let the needful be done within a period of three months from today.

7. Pending misc. application (s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

07.04.2025

Ali

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No