



RA-CW-157-2021 in CWP-11149-2020 1

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

**RA-CW-157-2021 in CWP-11149-2020
Date of Decision:17.02.2026**

Kiran Mayee

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI

Present:- Mr. K. K. Gupta, Advocate for the applicant-respondent No.3.

Mr. Udit Garg, Addl. A.G. Haryana

Mr. R.K. Malik, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Sandeep Dhull, Advocate for the petitioner-non-applicant.

JASGURPREET SINGH PURI J.(Oral)

1. Learned counsel for the applicant-respondent No.3 submitted that the only grievance of the applicant is with regard to page No.16 of the impugned judgment wherein it has been observed that it was an admitted case that respondent No.3 did not possess the bare minimum qualification and experience under the Statutory Rules whereas this observation is against the record because as per the qualifications at Page No.3, the requirement was post-graduation with 55% marks, whereas respondent No.3 possessed the said qualification, as reflected at Page No.6 of the

**RA-CW-157-2021 in CWP-11149-2020 2**

judgment, which shows that he holds three postgraduate degrees, including M.Ed. with 68% marks. He submitted that his limited grievance is only to seek clarification so that, in future, he does not get disqualified on account of the observations made in this judgment. He also submitted that he does not seek reversal of the judgment passed by this Court on merits but only seeks clarification to this limited extent.

2. Learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioner-non-applicant and learned State counsel submitted that in view of the limited prayer being made by learned counsel for applicant-respondent No.3, they have no objection, provided the aforesaid clarification is made on the basis of the record.

3. After hearing learned counsels for the parties and perusing the judgment, this Court is of the considered view that this aspect needs to be clarified that applicant-respondent No.3 does possess the minimum qualification which was prescribed. As per the chart at Page No.6 of the judgment, he is shown to be M.Ed. which is a postgraduate degree with 68% marks as well as an MBA with 60.7% marks. Therefore, the aforesaid judgment is modified to a limited extent to clarify that the applicant-respondent No.3 does possess the minimum academic qualifications.

4. However, applicant-respondent No.3 does not seek modification of the main judgment, particularly regarding eligibility under Rule 9, which provided that one of the methods was by way of transfer or



RA-CW-157-2021 in CWP-11149-2020 3

deputation of an officer already in the service of the State Government or the Government of India, and respondent No.3 was not working in the State Government or the Government of India.

5. In view of the above, present application is disposed of.

(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)
JUDGE

17/02/2026

shweta

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