
(2013) 09 P&H CK 0329

In the Punjab And Haryana At Chandigarh

Case No : Civil Writ Petition No. 20874 of 2013

Ranbir Singh

APPELLANT

Vs

State of Punjab

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 20-09-2013

Acts Referred:

Citation : (2014) 2 PLR 398

Hon'ble Judges : Jaspal Singh, J;Ajay Kumar Mittal, J

Bench : Division Bench

Final Decision : Dismissed

Judgement

Ajay Kumar Mittal, J.—Challenge in this writ petition filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is to the impugned notice dated 22.8.2013 (Annexure P-1) issued by the Registrar (Recruitment), Punjab and Haryana High Court, Chandigarh-respondent No. 2 whereby the application submitted by the petitioner to appear in the competitive examination for the appointment to Punjab Superior Judicial Service in pursuance of notification dated 29.4.2013 had been rejected. The petitioner was enrolled in the year 1999 as an Advocate with the Bar Council of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh bearing Enrollment No. PR/3035/1999. Vide notification dated 29.4.2013 (Annexure P-2), the applications were invited for selection of 14 candidates (9 from General Category and 5 from Scheduled Caste) for appointment to Punjab Superior Judicial Service by way of direct recruitment in the State of Punjab through a competitive examination under Rule 7(3)(c) of Punjab Superior Judicial Service Rules, 2007. In pursuance thereof, the petitioner had applied for the post of Additional District and Sessions Judge in the State of Punjab. However, on 22.8.2013, a notice (Annexure P-3) was published, wherein the name of the petitioner figured at Serial No. 20 and his candidature was rejected on the ground that he was in service. As per the averments made in the application, the petitioner after having practiced for seven years had joined as a Staff Reporter with a daily Hindi Newspaper "Dainik Jagran" on 4.6.2011.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that in the advertisement inviting applications, there is no such prohibition or restriction that any candidate who was employed at the time of application would not be considered but the only requirement was that the applicant should have practiced for a period not less than seven years on the date of application. Learned counsel for the petitioner has relied upon a judgment of the Hon''ble Supreme Court in Deepak Aggarwal Vs. Keshav Kaushik and Others, in support of his contention.

3. The similar issue came up before this Court in CWP No. 20549 of 2013 Pratima Devi Ranga Vs. State of Haryana and Another, . This Court vide order dated 19.9.2013 after considering the judgment of the Hon''ble Supreme Court in Deepak Aggarwal's case (supra), dismissed the said writ petition. Accordingly, the present writ petition is also dismissed.