

CASE NO.:
Appeal (civil) 6734 of 2003

PETITIONER:
R. LEELA BHAI

RESPONDENT:
K.R. VALSALA DEVI & ORS

DATE OF JUDGMENT: 29/01/2008

BENCH:
H.K. SEMA & MARKANDEY KATJU

JUDGMENT:
JUDGMENT

O R D E R

CIVIL APPEAL NO.6734 OF 2003
WITH
C.A.No.4181/2006 AND
C.A. NOS.917, 916 and 915 of 2008 ARISING OUT OF
SLP(C) NOS.25202/2005, 5723/2006 AND 2703/2007

C.A.Nos.6734/2003 and 4181/2006

Having heard the learned counsel for the appellants at great length, we see no reason to interfere. The appeals being devoid of merit are accordingly dismissed.

Civil Appeal Nos.917, 916 and 915 of 2008

SLP(C)Nos.25202/2005, 5723/2006 and 2703/2007

Leave granted.

Heard the learned counsel for the appellants at great length. The appellant has challenged the advertisement dated 26.10.1999 before the High Court. The learned Single Judge dismissed the petition on the ground of laches. The appeal before the Division Bench of the High Court met with the same fate. Hence these appeals.

In the advertisement the qualification prescribed for the post of Cashier-cum-Clerk in the District Co-operative Societies is B.A./B.Sc./B.Com with HDC or JDC or C.Com with Co-operation or B.Sc. (Co-operation and Banking) of the Kerala Agricultural University. It is the contention of the counsel that in the relevant service

: 2 :

rules the qualification prescribed is S.S.L.C. with J.D.C. and three years experience in the affiliated Primary Co-operative Society. According to the counsel the qualification prescribed in the Advertisement is contrary to the qualification prescribed in the service rules and discriminatory.

We see no substance in the contention. Since, the advertisement has been issued for all the candidates, we do not see any substance in the contention of the appellant that he has been thereby discriminated. We see nothing wrong in prescribing higher qualification in the advertisement.

These appeals being devoid of merit are accordingly dismissed.