

---

**(2014) 05 AHC CK 0222**  
**In the Allahabad High Court**  
**Case No : C.M.W.P. No. 27963 of 2014**

Pratibha Singh

APPELLANT

Vs

Union of India

RESPONDENT

---

**Date of Decision :** 20-05-2014

**Acts Referred:**

**Citation :** (2015) 1 ALJ 352 : (2014) 105 ALR 295 : (2014) 5 AWC 5437 :  
(2014) 143 FLR 170

**Hon'ble Judges :** Rajan Roy, J;Amreshwar Pratap Sahi, J

**Bench :** Division Bench

**Advocate :** Devendra Pratap Singh and Bhoopendra Nath Singh, Advocate for the Appellant; Ashok Singh, Advocate for the Respondent

**Final Decision :** Dismissed

---

## Judgement

Amreshwar Pratap Sahi and Rajan Roy, JJ.—Heard learned Counsel for the parties. By means of this writ petition the petitioner has challenged the order dated 4.3.2014 whereby she has been communicated the reasons for rejection of her candidature for appointment after her selection. The reason mentioned therein is the absence of minimum 3 years experience in the area of Credit Appraisal of industrial projects in Financial Institutions/banks. The impugned order clearly states that the general instructions relating to the advertisement in question clearly empowered the respondents to cancel such selection at any stage even after appointment.

2. The admitted factual position is that the petitioner does not possess the aforesaid experience. The impugned order in paragraph 6 states as under:

"6. It is also evident from your under-mentioned reply to the following question in the online application that it is well within your knowledge even before you applied for the post of Finance Executive that you did not possess the requisite experience for the said post:

"Do you have 3 years in the area of Credit Appraisal of Industrial projects in

Financial Institution/Banks" Reply furnished--No"

3. It being the admitted position the only question which remains to be considered is with regard to the contention of the learned Counsel for the petitioner that the aforesaid requirement was not an essential requirement under the rules. In this regard reference may be made to Annexure 4 to the writ petition wherein the age, educational qualification and post qualification work experience as on 1.1.2013 has been described. The relevant post for which the petitioner was selected is mentioned at serial No. 11 (page No. 28 of the writ petition) and the corresponding column 5 very categorically states that the "minimum experience" of 3 years in the area of Credit Appraisal of industrial projects in Financial Institutions/Banks was required. Therefore, the contention of the learned Counsel that the same is not an essential criteria is misconceived. The words "minimum experience" leave no room for doubt that it was an essential condition which was required to be satisfied.

4. The other contention of the learned Counsel for the petitioner is that in her representation submitted before the respondents after the judgment of this Court dated 13.1.2014 it had been categorically asserted that no other financial institution including Scheduled Bank/Nationalized Bank, was issuing service certificate to incumbents mentioning such experience. This contention is also misconceived. It is not the case of the petitioner that though she possessed the experience but while issuing the certificate in respect to the same specific mention has not been made as required by the advertisement. In fact the admitted factual position is that she does not have requisite experience of 3 years in the said field which was required.

5. Learned Counsel for the petitioner further submits that the impugned order is non-speaking and unreasoned order.

6. We have carefully perused the order and we find that it satisfies all the requirements of a reasoned and speaking order.

7. In view of the above, we do not find any reason to interfere with the impugned order. The writ petition is misconceived and is hereby dismissed.