

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

2025:PHHC:011899



202

CWP-432-2015 (O&M)

Date of decision: 27.01.2025

Sukhwinder Kaur

... Petitioner

vs.

State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Kiranjit Singh Bassi, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Manipal Singh Atwal, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Sanjiv Gupta, Advocate for the respondent No. 5

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J.

1. Prayer made in the present petition entails quashing the selection process for Supervisors, effectuated through the promotion of Anganwari Workers within the respondent-Department vide Annexure P-7, additionally, seeking a directive of her due consideration for the same.

2. Pertinently, the petitioner, a matriculate joined the respondent-Department on 02.08.1993 through a selection process, initiated via issuance of a Public Notice dated 23.12.2010, which aimed to fill up 286 posts of supervisor, where the criteria, notified on 08.07.2013, established two distinct eligibility pathways: candidates with matriculation requiring 8 years of service, while graduates needed 3 years.

3. The petitioner opted to compete under the graduation category for her promotion, but was not granted three marks meant for Diploma in Computers on the premise that the same was from an unrecognized Institution, which remained

uncontroverted even during the course of hearing and as per the formula applied for calculating the marks, she was given 4 marks for experience, the same being for 7 years post her acquiring the degree of graduation in terms of the criteria, which in an exhaustive pronouncement of **N. Suresh Nathan v. Union of India**¹, Hon'ble the Supreme Court held that qualifying service must be calculated from the date of obtaining the degree, as it aligns with both the structural framework of the rules.

4. The score of the petitioner being 18.53, as per the established criteria having been followed with mathematical precision, way lesser than the last selected candidate with 32.86 marks, thus, there being no merit in the present petition, the same is hereby dismissed.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

27.01.2025

ashok

Whether speaking : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No

¹ 1992 Supp (1) SCC 584