
(2022) 06 SHI CK 0086
In the High Court Of Himachal Pradesh
Case No : Civil Writ Petition No. 4155 Of 2022

Jai Pal

APPELLANT

Vs

State Of Himachal Pradesh And Others

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 29-06-2022

Acts Referred:

Constitution Of India, 1950 — Article 226

Citation : (2022) 06 SHI CK 0086

Hon'ble Judges : Sabina, J; Satyen Vaidya, J

Bench : Division Bench

Advocate : Hirdaya Ram, Vikrant Chandel

Final Decision : Dismissed

Judgement

Sabina, J

1. The petitioner has filed the instant petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, seeking following reliefs:-

"i) To quash and set-aside Annexure P-1 and Annexure P-3 i.e. Part Time Multi Task Policy, 2020 and Clarification dated 24.05.2022.

ii) To direct the respondent No.5 to cancel the BPL certificate of the respondent No.6 after conducting inquiry in impartial manner.

iii) That the petitioner being from Economically Weaker Section may be granted weightage of marks as the same benefit has been given by the Public Works Department of the State Government of Himachal Pradesh as per Annexure P-4.

iv) To extend date of submission of applications for the post of Part Time Multi Task Worker in view of the changing of Rules of Games in the middle of the selection process so that the petitioner and other eligible applicants/candidates may get equal opportunity of applying for the post of Part Time Multi Task Worker alongwith required documents as clarified vide Annexure P-3 in case Annexure P-1 and Annexure P-3 is not quashed and set-aside in the interest of justice."

2. After hearing learned counsel for the parties, we are of the opinion that this petition is liable to be disposed of in terms of the order dated 15.06.2022, passed in CWP No.3728 of 2022, titled Smt. Bhawani Devi versus State of Himachal Pradesh & others. The operative part of the said order reads as under:-

"5. Some clarifications were sought on different issues by various quarters with regard to the allocation of marks and validity of various certificates/documents, etc. In this regard, the impugned clarification was issued on 24th May, 2022. A perusal of the said clarification reveals that a Committee had been constituted to examine the issues raised during recruitment process for engagement of part time multi task workers. On the basis of the recommendation of the Committee a clarification was issued on 24th May, 2022. A perusal of the clarification No.4 reveals that term 'family' will be "land owner or his/her spouse or children". The said clarification has been issued by the respondents with a view to achieve the purpose of the scheme. This Court while exercising extra ordinary writ jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India cannot interfere in the meaning given by the respondents vis-à-vis term 'family'. As per the term 'family' defined for the purpose of the policy, petitioner does not fall within the definition of family. The respondents in their wisdom, with a view to effectively implemented the Policy, have defined term 'family' vide impugned recommendation dated 24th May, 2022. There is nothing on record to suggest that the definition of term 'family' has been given for any mala fide or extraneous consideration.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner has further submitted that the clarification issued on 24.05.2022 is otherwise bad in law as it amounts to change in rules after initiation of selection process. The contention so raised by the petitioner is liable to be rejected for the simple reason that Clause 7(iv) of the Policy only provided for grant of eight marks to those candidates whose families have donated land for school. The term "families" as noticed above, had been used in general term. No details were provided as to who would be included in the term "families". In view of this, it cannot be said that there is any change in the rules after initiation of recruitment process. The amendment is only clarificatory in nature and thus cannot be said to be bad in law.

7. In view of the facts and circumstances of the case, we are of the opinion that no ground for interference is made out. The instant petition is dismissed."

3. Petitioner is the grandson of the donor of the land and does not fall within the definition of 'family' as per clarification dated 24.05.2022.

4. Accordingly, the instant writ petition is dismissed, so also pending miscellaneous application(s), if any.