



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

**LPA-513-2020 (O&M)
Date of decision: 23.01.2026**

Varun Bhardwaj

...Appellant

Vs.

Haryana Staff Selection Commission and others

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ROHIT KAPOOR**

Present: Mr. Arjun Singh, Advocate
for the appellant.

Mr. Saurabh Mohanta, D.A.G. Haryana.

Mr. Varun Veer Chauhan, Advocate
for respondents No. 4, 6 and 7.

Mr. Sanjeev Sangwan, Advocate
for respondent No.5.

None for respondent No.8.

ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA, J. (Oral)

1. The appellant had applied for appointment to the post of Fire Station Officer. Initially, he was non-suited on account of his vision not being of the required specification but later it was found that the appellant also did not possess the qualification for the appointment to the post. The vision aspect, therefore, is not the reason for non-consideration of the appellant's case. It is actually the lack of qualification for the post, which is the foundation of rejection of the appellant's case.

2. The service conditions are governed by the rules, which prescribed the qualification for Fire Station Officer, the qualification reads as under:-



"Bachelor of Engineering (Fire) from a recognized University with minimum 55% marks or equivalent Cumulative Grade Point Average.

or

Graduate in Science with Chemistry as one subject at Graduation Level with minimum 55% marks or equivalent Cumulative Grade Point Average, and

Diploma in Fire Station Officer's and Instructor's Course from National Fire Service College, Nagpur.

or

Graduate ship examination of the Institute of Fire Engineers

or

Having passed membership examination of the Institutions of Fire Engineers of United Kingdom."

3. The qualification of the appellant is B.Tech in Computer Science with Chemistry as one of the subjects. The Bachelor of Engineering recognized in the rule is of Bachelor of Engineering (Fire), which is not the case here.

4. Learned counsel for the appellant states that the alternative qualification of 'Graduation in Science' is followed with a ';' and the use of expression '*and*' therefore, it ought to be read as '*or*' and as such, Diploma in Fire Station Officer or any of the other qualifications would also be the required qualification for the post.

5. Learned Single Judge has taken the view that the qualification prescribed for the post is Bachelor of Engineering (Fire) or in the alternative Graduate in Science with Chemistry as one subject. In addition to it, there are qualifications of diploma etc. in the case where the candidate has obtained Graduation in Science with Chemistry as a subject.

6. Having examined the rules as also the advertisement, we find



ourselves to be in agreement with the view taken by the learned Single Judge inasmuch as the legislature has distinctly used punctuation marks and the expressions to prescribe the required qualification. In the first part, the use of expression 'or' clearly indicates that the qualification could be in the alternative. In the subsequent part, the ';' and the expression 'and' has to be read in conjunction with Graduate in Science with Chemistry as one subject. The interpretation sought to be culled out by the appellant on account of use of punctuation not ';' and does not appeal to reason. Learned Single Judge has rightly rejected such contention.

- 7. Once that be the case, we find that the rejection of the appellant's claim due to non-possessioning of requisite qualification needs no interference.
- 8. The Letters Patent Appeal is accordingly, **dismissed**.
- 9. Pending application(s), if any, stand(s) disposed of.

(ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA)
JUDGE

(ROHIT KAPOOR)
JUDGE

23.01.2026

neeraj

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