



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

240

CWP-24009-2022

Date of decision: 05.05.2025

Sagar Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Lupil Gupta, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Amarpreet Singh Bains, AAG, Punjab.

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer made in the present petition is for quashing the impugned Clause 5 of Advertisement dated 05.04.2022 (Annexure P-4) which prescribe the upper age of 42 years for the candidates belonging to SC/BC category for the post of DDA/ADA.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that since he became over age during the Covid-19 pandemic by 11 days and as such, could not apply, thus relaxation in age should have been granted to him.

3. Learned State counsel refers to the judgment in the case of **Kamal Singh Vs. State of Punjab being CWP-10958-2022** decided on 27.04.2023 as appended with the reply as Annexure-R1/2 dealing with the same issue as also the aspect of maximum age of eligibility, which learned counsel for the petitioner could not distinguish which reads thus:

“1. A batch of 4 writ petitions has come up for the final disposal, though the recruitment notices are different, however, the issue which requires adjudication is common.



- 2. The petitioners pray for the relaxation in the maximum age or the experience required for the disputed post on account of delay in the result of qualifying exams on account of Covid-19 pandemic. The petitioners claim that their studies during the period of Covid-19 pandemic got adversely affected. It also resulted in delay in holding the qualifying examinations, for which they cannot be made the sufferers.
- 3. This court has considered the submissions of the learned counsels representing the petitioners.
- 4. The maximum age for eligibility in an exam is prescribed under the rules that govern the examination process, similarly the required experience is also governed by rules.
- 5. In exercise of the writ jurisdiction, this court does not find it appropriate to interfere. The Government, if so advised, may take a conscious decision keeping in account the interests of the parties because this matter is in the realm of policy decision.
- 6. Disposed of accordingly.
- 7. All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, are also disposed of.”

3. The present petition is disposed of in terms of **Kamal Singh** (supra).

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

05.05.2025
anil

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes / No
Whether reportable	:	Yes / No