

2026:PHHC:091108



**IN THE PUNJAB AND HARYANA HIGH COURT AT  
CHANDIGARH**

219

CWP-2486-2019  
Date of Decision: 07.07.2026

JAI KARAN EX. POWER

... Petitioner

VERSUS

UTTAR HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN LTD. AND OTHERS

... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY.**

\*\*\*\*

Present: Ms. Kajal, Advocate for Mr. Amit Kumar Jain,  
Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Punit Jindal, Sr. Advocate with Mr. Rahul Bansal,  
Advocate for respondent No.1 and 2.

\*\*\*\*

**AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)**

1. Reliance is placed upon the letter dated 31.07.2008, Annexure P-8 to contend that the qualification of the petitioner was equated with Graduation by the Indian Navy and he could apply for the posts mentioned in Annexure P-9 dated 31.07.2015 issued by the Navy, thus he ought to have been appointed to the post of UDC (Upper Division Clerk) pursuant to the Advertisement dated 30.02.2016, Annexure P-1.

2. Learned Senior Counsel appearing for respondent Nos.3 and 4, on the other hand, draws attention of the Court to the essential qualification for the post of UDC mentioned in the abovesaid Advertisement and stated that petitioner did not fulfill the same, thus the conditional offer of appointment was rightly withdrawn, relevant portion whereof read thus:

“i) Bachelor Degree in commerce with at least 60% marks for General Category and 55% marks for SC category candidates of Haryana Domicile from any university recognized by the Govt. of Haryana. The percentage marks required for other categories would be same as for General category candidates.

ii) Knowledge of Hindi/Sanskrit upto Matric Standard or higher education.

iii) "O" Level course or above of computer, for a minimum period of One year from NIELIT (DOEACC) or HARTRON.”

3. The petitioner is not eligible in terms of the above advertisement, as it is evident therefrom that mere degree of graduation was not required, but same had to be in the stream of commerce, that too with 60% of the marks. Besides the above, there were two more conditions, which as per learned Senior Counsel, the petitioner could not fulfil and nothing could be shown by his learned counsel to counter the same by referring to any document.

4. Petition dismissed.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)  
JUDGE

**JULY 07, 2026.**  
*Rajender*

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No