
(2013) 07 P&H CK 0559
In the Punjab And Haryana At Chandigarh
Case No : CWP No. 10444 of 2011

Prabhjeet Singh

APPELLANT

Vs

The State of Punjab and Others

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 17-07-2013

Acts Referred:

Citation : (2013) 07 P&H CK 0559

Hon'ble Judges : Tejinder Singh Dhindsa, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : Vipul Aggarwal, for the Appellant; Sudeepti Sharma, D.A.G., Punjab, for the Respondent

Final Decision : Dismissed

Judgement

Tejinder Singh Dhindsa, J.—The petitioner, who belongs to the reserved category of the Schedule Caste (Mazbi and Balmiki), had applied for the post of Constable in response to advertisement dated 10.09.2010, issued by the Director General of Police, Punjab for filling up 319 posts of Constables by way of direct recruitment. Out of these, 39 posts were reserved for Schedule Caste (Mazbi and Balmiki). As per criteria contained in the advertisement itself, marks were to be awarded for the educational qualifications, height as also interview. The present petition has been filed raising a grievance as regards his claim for appointment to the post of Constable having not been considered and having not been selected for the post.

2. It is not disputed between the parties that the petitioner was awarded 10 marks towards Educational Qualifications and 10 marks for height, strictly as per criteria laid down in the advertisement. Accordingly, the petitioner secured a total of 20 marks. In the written statement, filed on behalf of the State, it has been stated that candidates belonging to the reserved category of Schedule Castes (Mazbi and Balmiki), who obtained a minimum of 22 marks, were called for the interview. The petitioner having failed to secure such bench mark, was not called for the interview.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has raised the solitary argument that the petitioner has been denied five marks in spite of belonging to a rural area. Per-contra, learned counsel for the State would submit that no such marks had been earmarked to be awarded for rural area candidates in the advertisement and as such the same could not have been awarded.

4. Having heard counsel for the parties at length, I find that there is no merit in the petition and the same deserves dismissal.

5. The petitioner had applied for the post of Constable in the light of advertisement dated 10.09.2010. The petitioner's candidature would have to be considered strictly in terms of the conditions and stipulations contained in the advertisement. In the absence of any stipulation as regards awarding five marks towards rural area, the claim raised by the petitioner in the instant writ petition towards grant of such marks, cannot be held to be admissible. The petition lacks merit and is dismissed.